

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MARCH, 1851.

ART. I. — MEMOIR AND WRITINGS OF J. H. PERKINS.*

THIS is a monument, fairer than marble, reared by a surviving friend over one who has gone. Their intimacy from childhood seems to have been closer than that of brothers, and the Sketches of Mr. Perkins's early life contained in the first volume are written in such a frank and open and affectionate spirit, that they read more like personal confessions than a memoir. Those who knew Mr. Perkins will feel that the very man has been Daguerreotyped on these pages. His biographer shows how the tenderest friendship and the fondest memory are consistent with the most entire and simple truth.

Mr. Perkins was a remarkable man. He came up as nearly to the idea expressed in the phrase "a man of talent," — he had the varied capabilities implied in that phrase, and that elasticity of mind which shows itself in a ready aptitude for the most diverse occupations, in as high a degree, — as any man we ever knew. We have known many who were superior to him in a single department, but never one who possessed more power, capable of being made so easily available in so many

* *The Memoir and Writings of James Handasyd Perkins.* Edited by WILLIAM HENRY CHANNING. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1851. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 527, 502.

different directions. But however important this may have been in its place, it was not this which gave him his position of respect and influence. Were those who knew him best to describe him, we think that the first idea which would rise to their minds would be that of a noble, large-hearted, magnanimous man, who, though most tolerant in his judgment of other men, had a certain generous scorn of every thing dishonorable, selfish, or unworthy. His conscience had in it the quality of magnanimity. He was as patient and forbearing towards others, as he was exacting towards himself. He was straightforward as the sunshine, and knew nothing of by-ends and indirect methods. We cannot conceive that he should ever have been guilty of any untruthfulness; while those who had any affairs with him soon learned that he was governed not merely by common honesty, but by a rectitude of principle, which caused him to deal hardly with himself alone. He paid little thought to popular favor, he sacrificed without a regret promising opportunities of gain, and from early years dedicated his life to works of usefulness. He had great social gifts, and without the least pretension, or effort, or thought of becoming so, he could not help being the centre of any circle in which he moved. And there was such an independence, originality, and truthfulness in thought and speech and act, that, while most closely connected with others, he possessed always a marked and individual character of his own. In regard to superficial matters, he was often changeable, and sometimes apparently wayward, but it was because they were superficial, and because, while they interfered with more important ends, he would not suffer himself to be a slave to words and phrases and conventionalisms. But in the midst of minor peculiarities of character, he was one of the truest, bravest, simplest, and most generous of men.

In this connection, we cannot omit a reference to his religious views and character. They were the result of profound personal experience and of much individual thought. Like every thing else in his mind and character, his religious qualities bore the unequivocal stamp of reality. He was an earnestly believing and devout man. The absence of all pretence, the evident sincerity and fervor of his convictions, gave force to his simplest words;

for those who heard him knew that he was not uttering traditional phrases, but phrases full of an intense meaning to himself. He troubled himself little about appearances, but was as anxious to *be* as so many are to *seem*.

Mr. Perkins had the qualities both of mind and character which admirably fitted him for a new country. It was a judicious step for himself, and a happy one for others, when, at the age of twenty-one, he determined to make Cincinnati his place of residence. Cincinnati, which now contains a population of 140,000, and which promises before many years to be one of the capitals of the world, was at that time a comparatively small place of about 30,000 inhabitants. It was, however, already the intellectual centre of the West, and its society possessed a charm which can scarcely exist except in the first settlement of a country. The population, being composed principally of recent immigrants, was made up to a great extent of persons in youth or early manhood. It was a rare thing to see an old man. Such an amount of youthful blood gave a peculiar air of life and activity to the city. Few whom you met were natives of the place, but had come thither from every quarter of the world. Many who had been the ornaments of society in the cities of the Atlantic coast had here, for one reason or another, made their home. Among these was much more than a fair proportion of highly educated young men and cultivated women. There had not been time as yet to form those cliques and circles which necessarily grow up in older places. Every person stood very much on his own merits. Society was open, and social relations were determined, not by the accident of relationship or property, but by personal affinities. Those came together who were attracted by similarity of taste or culture; and nothing could be more frank, hospitable, and delightful, than the society organized on this natural principle. We write with freedom, for what took place in Cincinnati twenty years ago, from the great changes between, seems to belong to a remote historical era, rather than to our own time. We do not believe it possible for so much cultivation and elegance, such unbounded hospitality, such frank intercourse, to exist together anywhere except in the earlier period of a city's history. From the necessity of the case, strangers become friends,

and friends take the place of kindred. They necessarily rely upon each other, and must act in concert for common and important ends. There are some that read these pages, who will remember what we imperfectly describe; and we think it will strike them with surprise, when they call to mind how many of those then just entering life, and in the habit of sharing together the noble hospitality of the friends among their number who were a little older and had been somewhat more prosperous, have since become widely distinguished in different careers. As we write, there rises before us a fair company, richly endowed, with swelling spirits and energetic natures, entering on the greatest tasks as upon the pleasures of a holiday, thinking it no hardship to do or to endure, and resolutely bent on filling both an honorable and a useful place in the world. Some of them are now in their graves, but many of them have lived to occupy honorably the most responsible positions.

Among the number was Mr. Perkins. At that time the institutions of Cincinnati and of the West were in a forming state. The chaos was gradually shaping itself into a world. Schools, churches, customs of business, benevolent institutions, were assuming a determinate form. It was the time when foundations were laid for coming generations, and therefore a time when heavy responsibilities were thrown on each individual man. So much was to be done that young men hardly out of their minority, of necessity, frequently occupied positions of the greatest moment. They were obliged as they best might to plan for future times, with the conviction that as a community begins, it is very likely to go on. No one felt more justly than Mr. Perkins what one in such a situation might and ought to do. We have no doubt that the demands made on every right-minded young man in a city such as Cincinnati then was, had much to do with the development of the best qualities of his character.

He had been originally educated as a merchant; but on coming to Cincinnati in 1832, at the age of twenty-one, he commenced the study of law with Judge Walker, and, having completed the prescribed term, was admitted to the bar. He entered upon the practice of his profession with the most prosperous omens of success, having

already gained for himself a high reputation for ability, for his legal attainments, and his capacity for the transaction of business. Almost at the outset he had an amount of business confided to him such as most men gain only after years of patient waiting. His talent as a public speaker, the clearness of his intellect, his solid judgment and power of argument, won for him general admiration, and secured for him the respect and confidence of the leading men in his own profession. His fondness for the study of the great principles of jurisprudence as a science always remained, but the practice of law, partly on account of health, but principally because of moral considerations, grew distasteful, and at the end of about a year he relinquished it. He had already been connected with the *Western Monthly Magazine*, and was at this time the editor of a daily political newspaper. In addition to this, he became the editor of the *Chronicle*, a weekly literary paper, in which there appeared week after week many columns from his pen, of essays, tales, poetry, and criticism. He wrote with surprising facility, and such was his intellectual discipline, and so varied were his resources, and so easily did his thoughts take graceful and striking forms, that whatever he wrote possessed a peculiar charm which was certain to secure for it attention. In 1835, the *Chronicle* was united with the *Mirror*, and of this he became the editor, in conjunction with William D. Gallagher and Thomas H. Shreve, names since then known throughout the West, in connection with literature and political editorship. Under their united management, the *Mirror* became one of the most spirited and brilliant sheets ever published in this country. It was not, however, the time as yet, in the West, for such a publication to prosper. He was obliged to relinquish his editorial labors, and the failure of his health inducing him to turn his thoughts towards a country life, he determined, in 1835, to join some highly valued friends in forming an establishment for mining, milling, and manufacturing at Pomeroy, on the Ohio. In the general disasters, however, which soon after overwhelmed the business of the whole country, he was a sharer, and was obliged to give up projects which he had much at heart. The following letter, written at this time, shows the spirit in which Mr. Perkins met this reverse of fortune.

"*Pomeroy, September, 1837.* — Our worldly walkings and workings here have produced no fruit but certain potatoes and cauliflowers, together with a small modicum of wisdom. Some four thousand silver dollars have dwindled, under the united influence of bad times and worse management, to four hundred, paper currency, ragged and very greasy. Our house — just built here, under the shade of sugar-maples and oaks, with the Ohio a few hundred feet before us, and the mighty sand-cliffs, that whisk us back into past eternity, behind — we are forced to sell at half cost; and having but just unpacked and settled, as we thought, must pack up again and take up our march for another corner of the 'Garden of Eden,' as we think it best to call this earth, in order that she may have no cause of quarrel. Whither we shall go is somewhat uncertain, but most probably on to a small farm of ten or twenty acres, somewhere in the vicinity of Cincinnati, there to raise potatoes and fruit-trees, and write articles that might as well not be written.

"I have always had a standard with respect to daily employments, that I have been trying, so far without success, to live up to. I want hard bodily labor enough to keep me in health; enough of business to exercise my order, activity, and perceptive powers, and leisure enough for reading and writing to keep me from petrifying into a thorough man of business. Having weak eyes yet, I am forced to find daylight enough for all these things, and this, as society is now constituted, is no easy matter. In coming here I thought I had attained my end, but bad advice as to cost of building, bad management on my own part, and somewhat unlooked for mishaps, have disappointed me. I now propose to try the experiment on a smaller scale, content myself with a log-cabin, literally, and make a bold push for independence on an income of \$150 per annum! Such is a chart of my proposed course in a worldly way.

"Spiritually, I fear I have done scarce as well as in business. I have met some hard rubs, and my skin was too thin to stand them. However, I believe, all things considered, that both my outer and inner tumbles of the year past will help me in finally gaining the prize I am after, and that more speedily and certainly than an easier journey would have done. A great deal of latent selfishness still pervades my frame, and it wants a heavy pressure to force it out; and if that which has been on me has sometimes expelled it in explosive quantities, still so much of it is gone, which is a great comfort." — Vol. I. pp. 104–106.

In the winter of 1837–38, he returned to Cincinnati, where, before making any permanent arrangements for the future, he employed himself in various literary occupations. At this time he prepared a volume containing

the Constitutional Opinions of Judge Marshall, which received the highest commendation from Justice Story. He had also half prepared another volume, containing reminiscences of the St. Domingo insurrection by his father, who was there during the whole of that eventful period. The appearance of another work on the same subject, which seemed to forestall the market, prevented his completing it. He was also, as he continued to be to the end of his life, a constant contributor to Western periodicals, and to such works at the East as the *New York Review* and the *North American Review*, and a writer in our own pages.

Mr. Perkins had always been deeply interested in schools, in the general subject of education, and in the establishment of institutions which had for their object the moral and social welfare of the community. His attention was now particularly drawn to the subject of pauperism. Carrying out into action long-cherished convictions and feelings, he at length resolved to devote himself to this subject, and in the winter of 1838 - 39 he entered on his ministry to the poor. From that period till his death, he was a centre of charitable action in Cincinnati. He was singularly qualified for the work he had undertaken, possessing at the same time commanding abilities, great soundness of judgment, an unwearied benevolence, and the universal confidence of society. In lectures and in print, he treated largely of nearly every question relating to social progress. The wisdom of his views, and his ability to discuss these most difficult questions, are evident from the extracts which Mr. Channing has given from his writings. We know of few volumes which contain more that is worth the reading on these matters. And when it is remembered how much of this was written between the age of twenty-five and thirty, there are few who will not be surprised at the breadth, the far-reaching foresight, and the early maturity of his views.

His love of independence was seen here as elsewhere. In order to support himself, he opened a school for young ladies. Teaching was a work which he loved, and he continued it with signal success to the end of his life. In the mean time the pulpit of the Unitarian society became vacant, and, at the earnest desire of its members,

he became their minister. He however relinquished none of his other labors, and retained the place only until the society obtained the services of the Rev. Mr. Fenner, a young man whose early and beautiful promise was speedily cut off. At his death, Mr. Perkins again yielded to the urgency of his friends, and resumed his place as minister of the society, and continued such during the remainder of his life. As a preacher, he possessed peculiar, but very remarkable powers. He was listened to with equal respect and admiration, and his influence for all good ends was felt throughout the city.

It was our intention to have extracted largely from these volumes, but we find that we have already consumed much of the space allotted to us. Mr. Shreve says of Mr. Perkins, in a letter to his biographer, that, had he devoted himself to humorous literature, "he would have stood at the head of American writers in that line." We think there is scarcely any exaggeration in the remark. The following piece, written when he had hardly passed beyond the age of boyhood, will give some idea of the mixture of pathos and humor which were always ready to flow forth, but were checked by the more serious realities of after life.

"MY AUNT ESTHER.

"My first and best, and oldest of aunts! and yet no more my relation than the town-pump. Aunt Esther! she was the nursing mother of the whole dynasty of —s, father and grandfather, son and grandson; — they had all been fondled and spanked, washed, combed, and clothed by the venerable maiden. From her I learned to love 'lasses candy'; from her I learned to hate Tom Jefferson. Many an evening as I sat by her rush-bottomed and rickety chair, threading her needle, or holding, while she wound, skeins of silk or yarn, that I thought must be as long as the equator, — many an evening has she discoursed of the arch-rebel Napoleon, whom 'she would have torn to flinders,' she said, 'if she could only have got her hands on him'; though the next day she would set free the very mouse that had stolen her last pet morsel of cheese; for she was a very Uncle Toby, or rather Aunt Toby, in such matters.

"She told me of Napoleon, and her little work-table was the battle-field. Here was the ball of yarn, and there was the half-finished stocking, and yonder was the big Bible, supported by the spectacle-case. Old Boney himself moved among them in the form of a knitting-needle; and to this day I cannot think of the

Little Corporal, but as a tall bit of cold steel, with a head made of beeswax.

"From her, too, came my portrait of Washington, whom she had seen during his visit to the North. Year after year did those well-beloved lips pronounce his eulogy, and often was the hourly prayer put up by me for a long life to Aunt Esther and General Washington; little did I dream that one who to me had just begun to live, had been dead these ten years and more!

"And then came the war and the Hartford Convention; and such a time as we had of it, up in our little back-room! I don't know what it was that preserved the nation; for there was Aunt Esther and I, and the whole race of —s, in such a passion that we almost walked to England dryshod.

"Aunt Esther had one fault, — she was always too cleanly in her notions. It was probably because of her Federal and aristocratic associations, but certain it is that she could not even see a dirty boy without wanting to wash his hands. And this her most prominent organ was exercised most fully upon generation after generation, as each marched through her dominions. 'As bad as to be washed by Aunt Esther,' was a proverb in the dynasty. For many a long year no lines in the language were to me so pathetic and soul-harrowing as those from the Columbiad: —

Still on thy rocks the broad Atlantic roars,
And washes still unceasingly thy shores.'

To be 'washed unceasingly' was my beau-ideal of misery.

"Aunt Esther, familiar as she was, was still a mysterious being to me. I had never met any other of her name; and, having early in life heard the Book of Esther read, always thought of my old nurse in connection with Ahasuerus and Mordecai, and the tall gallows. Nor was the mystery diminished on being told, when I asked how long it was since Mordecai, that it was hundreds and thousands of years. How old she was I did not dare to ask!

"Brought up to bring up others, the venerable matron loved nothing so dearly as Scotch snuff and noisy children. When the storm waxed loudest in the nursery, she was most in her element, and walked undisturbed amid

'The wreck of horses and the crash of toys.'

"Her chief text and comfort was that in which we are told that our Saviour blessed the children brought to him, and said that of such was the kingdom of heaven; for to her it conveyed the idea that the place of rest would be brimfull of babies.

"And I grew up, and another generation came forward to claim my rocking-horses and my long-legged chairs. I went to school; and when I came home, I found Aunt Esther just as of old, only (as the saying is) a good deal more so. But though to

me time was a matter of some import, she defied it. Nay, I received a letter from my cousin, who had just been married, telling me that Aunt Esther had danced at her wedding. — was the old lady's last favorite ; gentle and kindly, she loved her foster-mother more than many do their own parents, and she meant to take the ancient to her new home, she told me. But when I arrived at Boston again, I found that this had not been done ; Aunt Esther could not leave the old nursery, with its yellow floor and barred windows ; and as little could she bear to lose her pet. From the day of —'s wedding, she began to go out ; her work on earth was done ; and from the arms of the last she had brought up in the fear of the Lord, she passed away to meet her new colony of infants beyond the skies.

"In one corner of the church-yard there had been a great oak, of which all had departed but a shell of bark a few feet high. From this shell, within a year or two, a young, tall sprout had sprung up. Under that emblem of the resurrection they laid the body of Aunt Esther. Above her they placed a three-sided obelisk ; upon the west side was carved the form of an aged woman, on the brink of the grave ; upon the east, that of a bright spirit, springing from the same grave ; while upon the front was her name and age, — 'Esther Pray, aged 91 years,' with a part of her favorite text, perverted and yet true, — 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven.'" — Vol. I. pp. 19-22.

The following passage, written in 1834, expresses better than any words of ours what we believe to have been the controlling views and principles of his life : —

"I am come to regard the world as an arena in which I have to do two things, — *improve others* and *improve myself*. I look upon myself, upon you, and upon all of us, as capable of improvement, infinitely. 'He that is faithful over a few things shall be ruler over many.' I am not willing to seek power here, simply because I look forward to the time when I shall have worlds at my command. I wish in this life to *fit* myself for that command ; and the only way of doing so is to perfect my nature, as far as I can. The highest, the divinest power in the world, is that of love, for by it God governs." — Vol. I. p. 85.

The following passage we quote from a letter to a young friend on the subject of Reading : —

"You could scarce ask me a harder question, than the one you now ask, 'What books should a young man read between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four ?' It is puzzling to answer such questions, not only because no two persons ought to go through the same course of reading, but because we study, not to heap up so much miscellaneous knowledge, but to learn those things of

which we are peculiarly ignorant, and to cultivate those of our faculties which most require it. While, therefore, I may be able to advise *you* very well, knowing you as I do, I am wholly unable to advise your brother; and as to the giving hints adapted to all, I would sooner turn quack, and give one dose for all constitutions and all diseases; for I think it better to trifle thus with the body than the soul. But there are some remarks which will apply equally to all persons and all courses, and to some of these I will ask your thought.

“I would first, then, say, never read without an *object*. If you have ever been called on to study with reference to the attainment of some definite end, you will remember that what you thus learned remained with you long after most that you read had been forgotten. Not alone because you went deeply into it at the time, but because it was in your mind so associated and incorporated with many other subjects, that it is easily brought back again in after life. Do not, then, read vaguely and without purpose; know what to expect from your book before you begin it; and at every step, see what bearing what you have read has upon the points before you. Many men read every thing twice,—once to find out what to read for, and again, to learn what is to be learned. Read, therefore, few very new books, the merits and objects of which you know nothing about; wait till you know whereof the last publication treats, and how it treats it.

“Next, I would advise you to read by *subjects*, not by volumes. I have known many scholars who had never read a book through in their lives, except, of course, those of mere amusement. In this way you get comparatively whole, not fractional views, and both sides of a question; you may thus escape partyism, partiality, and narrow notions.

“In the third place, I would recommend you not to commonplace your reading, but to *think it over, digest it*, and, if you have time, reduce your own views, obtained from what you have read, to writing, in a blank book. The thinking may be done while you are walking, waiting tea, sitting over the fire, or in attendance for an unpunctual friend. The secret of writing much and easily consists, I fancy, in sitting down to write with your thoughts already in your mind, instead of fishing in the inkstand for them.

“My fourth piece of advice is, to draw up for yourself a *systematic list* of all the subjects of human knowledge, made as particular as you please. By a glance at this you may see at once how little you know; may refresh your knowledge of your ignorance, and see to what subjects you most need to turn your attention.

“Lastly, I would say, keep by you a *blank book*, arranged as an index, in which you can enter references to those many pas-

sages and facts met with daily by a student, which have no immediate connection with the subject of the work in which they are found, and which we so often remember to have seen, but cannot think where.

"I will now call your mind to a question, which every systematic reader must ask himself, — Shall my reading be confined to one or two subjects until I am thorough in them, or shall it be general and superficial? Most whose advice you would follow would, I think, advise the first; for my own part, I am in favor of the last course. It is true, that superficial knowledge should be avoided where it can be; but to my mind, the true question is this, — Does it best become a being destined for eternity to gain a broad view of all that he can know, though a very imperfect one, or one more narrow and more perfect? If you look into what is said in favor of thorough studies, you will find them upheld, generally, as the means to gain worldly power or distinction; and, when this is not the case, they are contended for by those who have little or no faith in the doctrine, that our studies, habits, and occupations here will affect our fate hereafter. But to me it is clear that all the powers and capacities of the man are more perfectly developed, and brought out in better proportion, by gaining an outline merely of all knowledge within our reach, than by pursuing any one branch of knowledge into all its details; and the ridicule and scorn which have been heaped upon 'smatterers,' though it may properly apply to those who go from subject to subject without purpose and without system, cannot, with justice, fall upon students who go perfectly as far as they go, and stop because they perceive the inutility of going farther. Some one subject, it is true, will become the prominent one in every man's mind, and it is right it should be so, for every man owes it to the world, to extend, in some direction, the circle of knowledge, if it be in his power; but the prominence differs from the entire predominance of one subject. A man may carry his researches in natural or mental philosophy, history, or natural history, beyond the common line, and yet by no means give up other subjects. This has been done by some of the most eminent men in all branches, — Milton, Newton, Locke, Coleridge, Goethe. If you read the works of Coleridge, for instance, you will find continual references to all branches of natural and political science, and will see that from these he has drawn many of his most admirable illustrations, and gained from them that breadth and unity of thought which must ever distinguish him, despite his many faults; and the great German is a still more striking instance.

"But the habit of general and systematic study is by no means common among either great or small men. We are apt, if lawyers, physicians, or clergymen, to read upon no subject as we

should read, except that belonging to our profession, and seldom upon that. Other subjects we take up for amusement, and lay them down again to resume or not as occasion occurs. This I would advise you never to do. If a work on botany or biography falls in your way, do not touch it, unless you see that you can pursue that of which it treats to some purpose; and, above all things, eschew the habit of standing about a library or reading-room, dipping for a moment into this book or that review, and then turning to another.

“Reviews are at times of great use, because they compress knowledge and give references, and also because they excite an interest in subjects that, but for them, we might never approach; but they are, to the student, edged tools, to be used with great caution.

“I would say, then, let your reading be *general*, but by no means *promiscuous or vague*. You may learn enough of nature to have the God of nature always before you, to value all that he has made, and from his works, to learn the many lessons of mercy, faith, love, and courage that they were meant to teach, and yet be what men will call a smatterer; for you need know few names, and may be ignorant of many standard authors. But I should think you far wiser to gain this smattering than to give the time spent in its gain to becoming perfect and thorough in the dates of history, or the minute facts of statistics.

“But, while I advise a large field of study, I beg you to guard against the too current practice of making a very imperfect knowledge of a subject enough, whatever chances may occur for increasing it; I would be content with imperfection, because general perfection is impossible; but be as thorough as you can be, and never think that you know enough of a subject when opportunities offer to increase your knowledge of it. There is an essential difference between the man that is content with a scant view of the whole now, because he hopes to perfect that view hereafter, and the man that is content with it because he cares to know no more.

“One more remark, and I close; in choosing your subject of study, have your eye ever upon the great truth that should be our guide in every pursuit, and a full, ever-present, ever-influential faith in which is the beginning, and body, and end of all philosophy, — the truth that we are *immortal spirits*. Having this in view, you will not, as some do, spend years in acquiring knowledge that cannot have any influence, as far as we can see, upon the eternal interests of yourself or others. Having this in view, you will never narrow your reading to the newspapers and magazines of the day; nor yet despise them, for they are your only means of communication with the great mass of your fellows.

It is for want of faith in this truth, that the lawyer becomes a mere lawyer, the politician a devotee to the small interests of the time, and the tradesman a bondman of trade. Keep this truth, then, ever before you, by attendance on public worship, by private devotion, by the study of Scripture, by the study of nature, by reflecting upon your own powers, and going over again in thought your past life, in the opportunities and changes of which you may see the hand of God schooling you for the future, as clearly as you see it in the stars of night, the clouds of noonday, or the plan and formation of your own body." — Vol. I. pp. 92–96.

In all Mr. Perkins's speculations respecting the progress of society, he started from one fundamental principle, of which his other views and all his undertakings were but the development, — the necessity of raising the individual man to a higher level of excellence and Christian virtue, — a principle often stated in words, but by him intensely felt and faithfully acted upon. In his labors as a teacher, a preacher, and a minister to the poor, in his efforts to remedy pauperism and to improve prison discipline, in what he wrote in regard to slavery, education, political economy, and the various theories of social progress, we find this idea always prominent. It determined his course respecting himself. He sought variety of occupations because he believed that, if it was less favorable to worldly success, it tended to promote a larger and healthier development of all the moral and mental faculties of the man. However such a course might be adapted to persons of less subsistent characters and feebler purposes, there can be no doubt that it was favorable to him, and that, though he in some measure sacrificed the distinction which would have been easily within his reach had he confined himself to any one department of labor, it secured to him as a man a far higher and broader mind and character.

We quote one passage on the subject of slavery, which, remembering that it was written in 1836, and published in a work that depended almost as much on its Southern as on its Northern subscribers, we think will give a good illustration of the clearness of his mind, his method of thinking, and his personal independence.

"The so-called friends of the negro may be divided into two great classes, — those who look on him as a brute, and those who think him a man. If the former wish him free, it is that he may have more yam, hominy, and sleep; the latter would break

his chains, because the enchained man can never properly perfect the powers that belong to him as a man. One of the first class, after a visit to slave lands, will often defend slavery, because the African has better feed and a wider sty than the English and German peasants. Should one of the second class go with him, he would think of the palsied intellect, the strangled affections, the broken sense of right, and the entire moral stupor, that are scarce separable from slavery, however kind and Christian the slave-owner. The first would say, 'The slave is happy; he wants no more than he has'; the last would think, 'How miserable this man, that he *knows* not even his degradation!'

"To those who belong to the class of animalists, and who regard freedom as a means to present enjoyment merely, this paper is not addressed. We cannot go so far back, at present, as to discuss the question with them. We would now speak to those who believe the negro to be *in kind* A MAN, who believe freedom to be invaluable as a means to intellectual and moral improvement, and who believe it every man's duty to assist those properly within his influence to improvement, and therefore to freedom. To all such we state but a truism, when we say that, if to the slave present freedom would be the means of improvement, present freedom is his right; but if, in consequence of his unfitness to use freedom aright, or because of laws that degrade the free blacks, present freedom would not be a means whereby he may improve, that then it is not his right, nor is his master, by any principle, bound to free him.

"To the little child, present freedom would not be a means of improvement, and he is kept under restraint; to the idiot and insane man it would not be, and we confine them, even when not likely to injure others; we confine them for their own sake.

"But though the parent does right to restrain his son, being a child, what would we think of him should he do nothing to fit his son to become free? Though he that has charge of a lunatic is not only just, but kind, when he binds his patient even with fetters of iron, if need be, how unjust and inhuman would all think him, should he use no exertion to restore the poor wretch to reason! And what is the slave? He is a little child, needing restraint, needing punishment, but more than all needing *education*. He is a man void of sense, whose limbs it may be needful to fetter, that he may be cured of his disease, and fitted to serve and to advance himself.

"If the negro be in kind a man; if man be immortal, and destined ever to advance in intellectual and moral perfectness; if to this advancement freedom of will and self-dependence be essential; and if it be every man's duty to assist his fellows, — then it must be that the negro, however degraded and unworthy *now* to

be free, still has the right, not to liberty, but to that *process which will fit him for liberty*; and it must also be the duty of all that can influence him to urge their influence to this end; it must be that the slave-owner is bound to educate him,—that those who can influence the slave-holder are bound to enforce this duty.

“In this faith we speak, not as abolitionists, not as agitators, not as wishing to excite in any passion or unkind feeling, but as Christians, who think the African a man, having the privileges of a man, and, above all, the privilege of improvement. We are for *ulterior freedom* and *immediate action* that will fit for freedom. Were we now in New England, however, even this opinion we should think it unwise to publish; but standing as we do, upon the limits of the Slave States, and knowing that, of the little circle our voice will reach, many are slave-holders, we speak with more boldness than if afar off; for we have no fear that calm argument addressed to the slave-holders, and published in a Slave State, will be mistaken by any for agitation. But while we say this, we would dissent wholly from the doctrine that slavery is a mere *political* question. It is, and the laws of all Europe and America relative to the slave-trade recognize it as being a *MORAL* question, in which every man, as a man, is interested. The means by which slavery shall be done away in any State belong to politics and that State, the propriety and duty of doing it away belong to morals and the race.” — Vol. I. pp. 189 – 192.

To us there are no more interesting portions of these volumes, than those which describe Mr. Perkins in his domestic relations. He had a home lighted up with a sunshiny affection, of whose benignant influence on himself he was profoundly conscious, and nothing can be more beautiful than the glimpses which are given of it through his letters. He was subject to great despondency of spirits, and needed more than most men the encouragement and the softening influence of cheerful, hopeful, unfailing affection. This he had, and he attributed, we doubt not truly, much of that which was best in his character and happiest in his life to this source.

We have not attempted to give any account of his life, for we hope that our readers will make themselves acquainted with these volumes. They are fitted to inspire one with high aims and purposes. Whatever Mr. Perkins was as a writer or public speaker, he was still more as a man, and his influence depended, not merely on what he said, but on the universal conviction that, what-

ever he said, he was a man who loved truth, honored rectitude, and was ready at any personal cost to dedicate himself to the highest ends. His character was not one of the smooth and rounded ones without defects and without virtues, "in conscience weak, but in discretion strong"; —

"Not his the light war with its feeble rage,
Which prudent scruples with faint passions wage."

All the elements of his character were positive and full of energetic life, and one great value of this memoir consists in its showing the character of one, who, endowed with strong passions and sensitive to the most varied motives, strenuously, persistently, faithfully, learned to subdue them to conscience, and to bring them into subjection to the law of God. It is an admirable example of one who from early years devoted himself to high Christian ends, and through a prevailing love of truth and right made his life a centre of good. His course was one of constant, moral, and religious progress, and it is well that a record of it should be preserved, to inspire with like purposes those who did not know him personally.

We cannot close this notice, without referring to the admirable manner in which Mr. Channing has performed the work assigned to him. The memoir which he has prepared will, more than such works usually do, give to the reader an idea of the man whose portrait is drawn. In the account of his youth spent in the country, so true is the description of a dreaming boyhood and of country scenes and occupations, that many will half fancy that Mr. Channing has taken a page out of their own lives. The memoir is always affectionate, but it is neither vague nor untrue. It discloses all the peculiarities of the man with a kind of confidential freedom, which makes the reader a sharer in the intimacy of friends. The memoir, however, is brief, the two volumes being composed principally of Mr. Perkins's letters and writings. The work will possess an interest for all who like to read the writings of a strong, clear, independent, and, in a high sense of the words, an original thinker. But we would commend it especially to young men. During his life he had a remarkable power to attract and influence them, and

we think that these volumes will be found to possess an influence something like that of his personal character. We commend them to young men, because they disclose the intellectual and moral struggles through which, in a greater or less degree, all must pass, and at the same time show how the early tendencies of character may be made to take right directions. Above all, we commend them because they exhibit the character of one who from early years strove to govern himself by high principles, and who kept before him, as the result of self-discipline and of all his labors, the highest and worthiest ends.

E. P.

ART. II.—COMTE'S POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY.*

WE have indicated below the title and dimensions of a work more frequently commented on and alluded to than generally read or understood. Excepting the work itself, we know of no source easily accessible whence one may gain a sufficient and fair view of the author's doctrine and purpose. A highly favorable notice of the first two volumes, with some little criticism of his theological position, by Sir David Brewster, appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*;† but this was when those portions only were complete which treat of Mathematics, Astronomy and Physics,—making, in fact, only a part of his introduction. The range of the author's speculation was too briefly indicated as yet to give an opportunity for a sufficient judgment of it as a whole. Some excellent remarks, unhappily not in print, were made nine years ago, in Professor Walker's course of Lowell Lectures. Morell, in his *History of Philosophy*, employs a single chapter in a very brief and unsatisfactory notice of his supposed position, having evidently studied but a small portion of the work, and that carelessly. Altogether the best general view of M. Comte's style of thinking is to be got from

* *Cours de Philosophie Positive*, par AUGUSTE COMTE, ancien Elève de l'Ecole Polytechnique, Répétiteur d'Analyse, etc. Paris: Bachelier. 1830-1842. 8vo. 6 vols. pp. 739, 724, 845, 736, 775, 904.

† Vol. LXVI. p. 167.

his disciple and correspondent, as well as expounder and critic, John Stuart Mill, whose "Logic" is in many of its most valuable parts a simple reproduction and exposition of our author, to whom he does ample and admiring justice.*

The work itself is not very inviting, except to one who is prepared to make a faithful and patient study of the subject it treats. Its method is careful and elaborate, but concealed under the inconvenient form of Lectures, sixty in number, and ranging in length from forty to more than three hundred and forty pages each. Neither an index, nor a full table of contents, gives a clew to this great wilderness of thought. Absolutely no division, save of paragraphs and pages, marks to the eye the progress of the argument; and this in a lecture perhaps long enough for an ordinary volume, and making in itself an elaborate treatise of science or history. The style is one which we have heard characterized by a dauntless and universal reader, as the only *unreadable* French he ever saw. It is made up of the steady and continuous flow of sentence after sentence, of discouraging length, without the convenient marks of parenthesis and colon, requiring each a special effort of mind to encounter it, and having no relief except that found in the pregnancy of the thought, and a terseness and pungency of expression amounting at rare intervals to a grim and titanic humor. Add to this, that for the understanding of the earlier portion a special culture is required, and a familiarity with scientific knowledge which belongs to few, and we find reason enough why most persons have contented themselves with remote allusions and sweeping criticisms, rather than undertaken the task of a fair and full review.

The last difficulty in the way of a due appreciation of it, we have by no means been able to surmount: the others we have encountered to the best of our ability. Not to pretend to more than we have been able to accomplish, we shall presently indicate more exactly the character of the several divisions. Before coming to the work itself, we shall say something about the man, his intentions in it, and qualifications for it.

A "personal preface" to the last volume affords most

* See especially Book VI. Chap. X.

of the materials we have for knowing him. "Born," he says, "in the South of our France, [in Montpellier, about the year 1798,] of a family eminently catholic and monarchical, brought up, too, in one of the lyceums in which Bonaparte vainly endeavoured, at great cost, to restore the old mental preponderance of the theologico-metaphysical régime, I had hardly reached my fourteenth year, when, passing of my own accord through all the essential stages of the revolutionary spirit, I already felt the fundamental need of a universal regeneration, both political and philosophical, under the active impulse of the salutary crisis whose principal phases had preceded my birth, and whose irresistible ascendancy was the more sure upon me, that, being fully in harmony with my own temper, it was then suppressed everywhere about me." At the Polytechnic School, he clearly perceived "the need of applying to vital and social speculations the new method of philosophizing which he had learned in regard to the simpler subjects; and the feeling of the true encyclopedical hierarchy began gradually to develop itself in him." The need of the "harmony of intellectual and political tendencies" brought him at one time strongly under the influence of the ill-instructed and illogical enthusiast (as he afterwards regarded him), Henri St. Simon, of whose doctrine he was reputed to be "one of the most fervent disciples."* Being presently dissatisfied with this vague and random turn of thought, he set to thinking more resolutely for himself; and in 1822 made the discovery of his "great fundamental law" of human development, which it thenceforth became his business to expound, illustrate, and apply. This he did in preparatory treatises of his own, and also by essays in sundry journals in 1825-26;† embodying his views, moreover, in a course of lectures about the year 1829, which he afterwards wrote out in this voluminous treatise.

Meanwhile, devoted to a solitary and studious life, he

* *Littérature Française Contemporanée*, in which the notice of Comte is both incomplete and incorrect.

† A short attack of insanity in this latter year (in which he found more to dread from the treatment than the disease) doubtless gave occasion to the vague rumor, that his speculations had terminated in this catastrophe. He recovered from it in due time, thanks to the vigor of his constitution, so as to observe and use it for scientific purposes, and went on with his self-appointed task.

supported himself by mathematical instruction, from as early as 1816. His attainments in this department were eminent and unquestioned. Authority as high as any pronounces him to be the most masterly expounder of the philosophy of mathematics. An inferior position as teacher in the Polytechnic School was grudgingly given him, which he accepted as a relief from the drudgery of his private lessons, and as securing him freedom and opportunity to work. It is needless to detail the discomfort and grievance to which his somewhat surly independence here exposed him, or the story of the jealousy pitifully exhibited, as he complains, in his whole treatment. "In proportion," he says, "as my intellectual position has been clearly defined by the successive appearance of the several volumes of this treatise, an inevitable official decline has not prevented towards me the hostile demonstrations of that incorrigible party, which, feeling itself for five centuries more and more incapable of maintaining any real discussion, still aspires, even in its dotage, to exterminate or revile its various philosophical adversaries. In spite of its usual circum-spection, the court of Rome has lately fulminated against a still unfinished work one of those ridiculous censures, which have henceforth lost even the singular power (that still subsisted in the last century) of inducing people to read the works which are the object of them,—towards which the public now does not even deign to inform itself of any such proscription." M. Comte sturdily persisted in his heretical reform; and, as the best primary instruction in his "positive" faith, lectured the public gratuitously on astronomy. So the churchmen actively tried to deprive him of his office; the metaphysical and politician party, in silent jealousy, studiously kept him out of sight; and from the pedantic and narrow-minded men who made the scientific corps, his treatment was not much better. Notwithstanding the honorable regard of a few, whose friendship he proudly claims, and the heartier appreciation of the young men who learned of him, he was effectually shut out from all hope of promotion; and, for any thing we know, the discreditable controversy has been going on to this day.

M. Comte's method of study, he tells us, has been to amass, while he had occasion, all the knowledge he could

bring to bear on the points he had in hand, thus completing at a very early age what must have been a large and thorough course of study; and thereafter, to trust himself wholly to the working of his own mind,—not so much as reading a single periodical journal, or taking note of the thoughts and reasonings of other men, and only posting himself up at intervals with the progress of mathematical knowledge. The material thus gathered and treasured up he gives out rapidly, and almost disdainfully, when the occasion calls; writing only for the press, almost without revision, and resuming, without break or discontinuity, after months or years of interval, his train of thought precisely where he left it off. The work in our hands, extending in its publication over twelve years, and once suspended for five years, is a curious example of completeness, steadiness, and uniformity of design. Towards the close, its proportions expand somewhat, and its tone becomes more confident and earnest; but the form and style of thought have as complete a symmetry as the working of a geometrical theorem. There is even a nice and curious consistency in the undertone of feeling, allusion, and prejudice, very noticeable as one comes to review and revise the work as a whole.

His manner of thinking and writing has its disadvantages as well as gain. The temper of thought becomes over positive and arrogant. Nothing of its harshness is lost by attrition. Prejudice is confirmed, and becomes morbidly consistent and strong. The style suffers for want of the tempering that more care would give,—perhaps from an undue scorn of the rhetoricians and “litterateurs.” Though dense and strong, it is all formed after the same cumbrous and fatiguing model. Unconscious, for want of comparison, how far he agrees or clashes with other minds, he shows often a steadiness of misappreciation, and a systematic injustice, quite unworthy of what we must concede to be the breadth of his thought, and the integrity of his purpose. Nowise insensible to these defects, yet with frank and ample honor for what he has undertaken and done, we will attempt now a more distinct, though brief and cursory, notice of his great work.

Its design is nothing less than *the recasting of the whole system of modern thought and knowledge* (and by

anticipation the social system too), *on the basis given in the method of the natural sciences*. He sets out, in the very first page, with the statement of what he considers his own grand discovery of the fundamental law of human development; namely, "that each branch of our knowledge passes in succession through three different theoretic states, the theological state, the metaphysical or abstract state, and the scientific or positive state." This most convenient generalization of what he shows to be an obvious and undeniable fact in the history of speculation, — appearing to him,* after seventeen years of constant meditation, "as fully demonstrated as any of the general facts at present admitted in the other branches of natural history," — serves as the key to his whole system. We cannot dwell upon his elaborate exposition of it in the two introductory lectures, but must content ourselves with the simple statement. It seems to express, clearly and unexceptionably enough, the transition (which necessarily takes place in the mind of a thinking man *au niveau du siècle*, and which is exhibited on a great scale in the mental history of the race) from the wandering and imaginative state which invests every thing with life, and regards all things as the direct exercise of volitions kindred with our own, to that condition of calm observation and reasoning, which investigates phenomena and "their invariable relations of succession and similitude," and makes science possible. Metaphysics is a middle state, dealing in "intermediate conceptions of a bastard character," — one of vague abstractions and barren jargoning. The other two are the natural and healthy extremes of mental development, — the right beginning and the inevitable term.

The peculiarity of M. Comte's view is, that he carries this maxim or generalization with unvarying and inexorable steadiness through every department of thought and life. He prefixes to his treatise a tabular view of the objects of human knowledge, dividing them into six grand classes. These are ranged in the order in which they pass through the preparatory stages, and arrive at the final or positive state. Thus the simpler and more general will come first; the more special and complicated last. It is the distinguishing feature, the peculiar boast,

* See Vol IV. p. 655.

of his treatise, that, by dealing with "Social Physics" as a special science, having its own methods, and guiding to its own results, he has filled the gap that remained too long open, and completed definitely and for ever the circle of the sciences; so that henceforth there will be nothing to do but to follow out, strictly and legitimately, the true scientific method in every thing. The others will henceforth have "only an historical existence."

His hierarchy (or ascending series) of the sciences, consists accordingly of the several departments of Mathematics (abstract and concrete), Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Biology (including the study of the "intellectual and moral, or cerebral functions"), and, lastly, Sociology; which is the crown and completion of the whole. The first two may be considered as having fully arrived at the positive state. No one thinks of going behind a rule in mathematics, or a law in astronomy. Each is simply and only the expression of a fact, which no one pretends to question or define. Yet it is evident that each of these had its "theological state" at starting. The mystic properties of numbers were firmly believed in once. Pythagoras preceded Plato. A tinge of superstition lingers even now in the popular mind, as to lucky numbers and lucky days; as if the numerical figure had some secret power and a will of its own.* But the busy Greeks dispersed that mist, and put thinking men, by their arithmetic and geometry, on the track of true science. Astronomy lingered more than a thousand years behind; and the dreams of the astrologists, which serve now to point a jest, or hoax the vulgar, were serious and sublime realities to an earlier age, and only slowly yielded before the unsparing calculus of Kepler and Newton. In the process and the effective work of the strict sciences, we know nothing of secret powers and unseen agencies; we deal only with the fact. Science is equivalent here to prescience. To know is to foreknow. And we deal with the future fact as easily and certainly as we deal with the present and the past.†

* We suggest this illustration, as a suitable filling out of the author's idea. So far as we remember, he does not indicate that the science of numbers ever passed through the "theological" period.

† Astronomy he regards as especially antagonistic to theology, "precisely because it is *more a science* than any other": it dispels the superstitions which, without its cultivation, would presently return. Vol. II. pp. 35, 36. "Foresight of a providential event would be sacrilege." Vol. IV. p. 314.

The progress of thought which we see so clearly in these cases is slowly going on in each of the successive departments already named. We know the confused and crude conceptions which have beset such matters as electricity, heat, and light, and the whole range of Physics, except the laws of weight alone, which we are content from the beginning to take as simple fact.* Numberless attempts have been made, for example, to explain scientifically, not the laws of the simple phenomenon, *light* or *heat*, but the motions of an imaginary emanation or ether, supposed to convey the same; and electricity and magnetism are bewildered, to this day, with doctrines of imponderable fluids, their circulations and their antagonisms.† All these are relics of the metaphysical stage, which supervened upon the theological,—which came in vogue when the special divinities of polytheism were unseated, and all things were held tributary to a Universal Will. To be aware that we are on a wrong track, is a token that we are about to change our course. More recent investigations (especially those of Fourier with regard to heat) are putting the doctrines of Physics in less exceptionable shape. This department, accordingly, is in the transition state, from the metaphysical to the positive stage.

In the next class, we find far more of vagueness, and feebler approaches as yet to a true scientific apprehension. Chemistry is hitherto “not science, but erudition,”—a gathering of facts, with uncertain theories of their connection, but without the positive and clear notion of their real character; with more obstinate habits of referring them to imaginary agencies, with more obtrusive relics of the old metaphysic doctrine of “entities.” And still more perplexing and perplexed do we find that class of chemical relations, which mark the obscure boundary between organic and inorganic existence.‡ Chemistry proper,

* Polytheism, nay, Fetichism itself, had a germ of positivity; since there was never accounted to be a god of weight. Vol. IV. p. 694.

† Franklin had “irrevocably destroyed, even in the least cultivated minds, the religious theory of thunder.” Vol. II. p. 427.

‡ Our author thinks there is no “reason to suppose the most complicated phenomena of living bodies to be essentially of a different nature from the simplest inorganic” (*corps bruts*). Vol. I. p. 89. Also, that all bodies are naturally and spontaneously active in certain ways; a purely passive state is “a veritable absurdity.” Ibid. p. 551.

with its doctrine of equivalents or definite proportions, is compact and clear, beside those inextricable, fluctuating, and undeterminable combinations, which mark the chemical conditions of organic life.

It would be quite hopeless to go in the regular way through the whole series of the sciences, till we come to the "positive" condition of them all, and so arrive in due course at the purely scientific stage of those which are vastly more complex and comprehensive than all the rest, — the phenomena of the human mind and of human society, now abandoned almost wholly to the old influence of metaphysics and theology. It is time, therefore, thinks our author, to *take for granted* his fundamental law, and apply it by anticipation to the topics which remain. Intellectual and moral philosophy (at least their essential rudiments in the human constitution, leaving their full development for his final science, Sociology) are accordingly despatched summarily, in a discourse of Biology. Among many lucid and happy suggestions as to the essential conditions of vegetable and animal life, thought and emotion are treated simply as functions of the brain. Gall is duly honored for having opened the way to regarding the study of the mind as a positive science;* the method of the psychologists is elaborately set at naught, and the essential doctrine of phrenology is accepted, not without a side-stroke at its sciolist expounders.† Mill very justly censures this rapid and summary merging of all mental study into the mere working of the brain and nerves, — certainly quite as difficult to observe as some of the plainer laws and processes of the human understanding.‡ It is needless to add, that our author regards the human and brute mind as essentially the same; considers that a cat has as distinct a sense of personality as a man; and scorns the use of such a term as *soul*, as any other metaphysical "entity" or imaginary fluid.§ It will be obvious that

* "You are to *abstract* your mind, i. e. watch its operations when there is nothing going on: this will doubtless be all stage-play to our descendants." Vol. I. p. 36; also, Vol. III. p. 457.

† Vol. III. p. 824.

‡ "Logic," Book VI. Chap. 4, § 2.

§ Vol. II. p. 447. The term "reasoning animal" is nonsense; all animals must reason; they use reason as men do (if we observe them as we might "men of speech and manners previously unknown"), to satisfy organic

the topics of intellectual philosophy thus rapidly touched upon, (towards which he seems to show a lack of courtesy, to say the least, best explained as a relic of his old quarrel with the metaphysicians,) are reserved for more deliberate handling, when he comes to regard them in their proper place, among social phenomena.

The three volumes thus cursorily noticed are, as we have said, simply introductory. They contain many admirable views (if they may not be called treatises), critical and historical, of the special sciences, and furnish probably the most able and complete exposition to be found of their several processes and results. Still, his province hitherto is mainly critical and expository, rather than constructive. He is laboring, so to speak, in other men's fields. Henceforth, the ground he is to occupy is his own. He enters upon it in a masterly manner, and works in it, to do him justice, with a steady step, a thorough oversight, and a strong and skilful hand. Once allow for the speciality of his position, and the whole becomes eminently instructive and valuable. Hardly a page or a line is without its fertile suggestion, and its traces of close and profound thought. He proposes in his way to answer the whole great problem that weighs upon the mind and destiny of Europe: and he addresses himself to the task with all the gravity, earnestness, and concentrated strength, which become a man feeling himself as it were alone, and speaking on so transcendently great a matter. And, still to do him justice, there is an apparent good faith, a strong sense of morality, a humanity amounting at times to tenderness,* a force of conviction that, though he may not be heard now, he is yet saying what men must some time listen to, and what they will

wants, and language (of a sort) in accordance thereto. They exercise their faculties, for the simple satisfaction of doing it; "invent new games, like children and savages"; are subject to *ennui*,—"that state which has been falsely made a privilege of human nature is sometimes so decided among certain animals, as to drive them to suicide, in consequence of captivity which has grown intolerable." Vol. III. pp. 785, 786. He doubts whether there be any exclusively human faculty, "if we compare without prejudice the acts of the highest Mammifera with those of the least developed savages"; we view them too much on a level, as a despot views his subjects; and human social progress is gained partly by suppressing their progressive faculty. Ibid., pp. 832, 833. Animals, moreover, "arrive spontaneously at a sort of rude fetichism." Vol. V. p. 36. See, in general, Lect. XLV., on "Intellectual and Moral, or Cerebral, Functions." Vol. III. pp. 763-845.

* See for example, as to treatment of animals, Vol. III. p. 326, and Vol. IV. p. 440.

be inevitably compelled to accept and apply, — which put him in most favorable comparison with any purely *ethical* writer whom we know. For breadth and minuteness of view, no statement is superior to his of the condition of things under which he writes. For largeness of intellectual grasp, and steadiness of conception and development, we know not where to find any thing more impressive than his statement of the whole intellectual and social problem, as gradually unfolded and brought down to us, by the entire course of the history of mankind.

His object, as he avows it,* is, “the resolution of our intellectual anarchy, the real origin, first of moral, and then of political anarchy.” This condition is the “result of the always increasing decline of the theologico-metaphysical philosophy (which has come in our day to a powerless decrepitude), and the continual, but still incomplete, development of the positive philosophy, hitherto too narrow, special, and timid to possess itself of the spiritual government of humanity.”† It is absurd at the present day to go back, for the support of social order, to “a political system which has not been so much as able to support itself before the natural progress of mind and society.” To talk of submitting reason to faith, — the last refuge of theologians, — when reason itself must be the judge of such submission,‡ is only to expose still further the hopelessness of that attempt. The retrograde party, represented by the Roman Church, is divided against itself. In Ireland it demands freedom of conscience as against the government; in Spain it denies and scouts the same. The system is fallen into inevitable decline; it has “ratified its own political degradation”; and the order it once established is for ever lost.

Nor is the metaphysical party in much better case. With its theory of antagonism between government and people, with its fictitious hostilities and balancings of powers in the state, with its crude doctrine of unlimited freedom of opinion, — a doctrine nowhere practically allowed, — and its religious conviction degenerated to “that vague and impotent theism which, by a monstrous

* Vol. IV. p. 4.

† Ibid. p. 8. He acquits the several parties, by the way, of any evil intent, which, he says (p. 16), “especially in politics, is eminently exceptional.”

‡ Ibid. p. 25.

combination of terms, it calls natural religion," — it has fulfilled, at best, a transitionary function, and its vital force is spent. Some ephemeral sects have "preached, as the final term of social perfection, a sort of reëstablishment of the Egyptian or Hebrew theocracy, founded on a genuine fetichism, vainly dissembled under the name of Pantheism."* The immense power of Bonaparte was squandered "in the vain restoration of the military and theologic system." The framers of those "transitory compromises" called constitutions have (at least in France) succeeded no better. There is a chaos of conflicting opinions on every subject. Hence such vagaries as are now afloat relative to the disuse of money, the destruction of great cities as harmful to the public welfare, the equalizing of wages, or setting a maximum thereto, and the absolute abolition of capital punishment "in the name of a vain metaphysical assimilation of the most worthless scoundrels to the simply diseased." Morality in public life is as good as extinct; and in private life is in peril. The whole political world is given over to the reign of "charlatanism and mediocrity." All the hopes of the retrograde party are destined to be extinguished by successive revolutions. And the men of science, who have in their philosophic method the only key to the solution of the problem, are utterly indifferent to the whole question of social progress.†

Such is the dreary picture which M. Comte gives of the intellectual condition and political hope of modern Europe. The need and sufficiency of the style of thought he advocates come next in view. It is contradistinguished from the former philosophies by the preponderance of reason and observation over imagination and abstract argument, as to method, and by renouncing "the search for absolute notions," as to doctrine, — the precise reverse of the two former school methods of thinking.‡ In other words, it corresponds to a more highly developed condition of the human intellect. There is doubtless real progress, — improvement of men's *condition* and their *faculties*. This, however, affects not the question of the comparative happiness of different ages. Social phenom-

* Vol. IV. p. 75; Vol. V. p. 42.

† See the whole of Lecture XLVI., Vol. IV. pp. 1-224.

‡ Vol. IV. p. 293. See also Vol. VI. pp. 701, 721.

ena are the most complex, and hence the most imperfectly regulated and most easily modified of all. *Each social system is the best which the conditions admit.* Alter the conditions (intellectual and moral) and the way is open for all degrees of social improvement.*

Here follows the exposition of his doctrine of human society, — divided again (to borrow terms from mechanics, as might equally well be done from any other science, as music) into the two grand departments of social Statics and Dynamics.† With the first, essential and valuable in its place, we have nothing now to do. It is his development of the fundamental law of social evolution which chiefly interests us. It corresponds in a loose and general way, stage by stage, with the intellectual evolution before described.‡ The three great periods of history are sufficiently characterized as corresponding to the theologic, the metaphysic, and the positive state of the human mind.

The first development of society is essentially religious. "The admirable spontaneity of the theological philosophy breaks the vicious circle," and gives suitable subjects of contemplation and a stimulus of action.§ Miracle and prayer ("that remarkable condition spontaneously produced in the entire human brain by this important phenomenon, at once intellectual and moral") necessarily attend upon the first steps of human evolution.|| Society is organized under the auspices of a priesthood, — the intellectual class. Without it, man would have remained "little above the apes." Its function is at best provisional. It becomes the needful and effective agency, for want of better. And the earliest form of human society is at once theocratic and military, — a double contrast to

* Vol. IV. pp. 387, 395.

† Static and Dynamic, "as fitted to act, and as really acting," — definition borrowed from Blainville. See Vol. I. p. 33.

‡ Vol. IV. p. 735. "The fundamental type of human evolution, as well individual as collective, is found in the increasing preponderance of our *humanity* over our *animality*"; and in particular, of the intellect over the propensities, and of the sympathetic instinct over the personal. Vol. VI. p. 837.

§ It is needful, "as the rallying-point and food of mental activity." Questions the most radically inaccessible are precisely those first attempted, while those really solvable are scorned. The mind in its infancy needs the stimulus of "those chimerical hopes, those exaggerated ideas of the importance of man in the universe, which give birth to the theological philosophy." Vol. I. p. 10; also, Vol. V. p. 72.

|| Vol. IV. p. 673. Add to this the needful agency of *ennui*. Vol. III. p. 754.

its final condition, which we are approaching now, as scientific and industrial.

The successive stages are next elaborately detailed, as a parallel and illustration of his fundamental law. The theological order of society has three well-marked periods, fetichistic, polytheistic, and monotheistic. The first is shown in the spontaneous and rude life of savages; the next, in the advancing civilization of Egypt, Greece, and Rome; and the last, in the social rule and order of the Catholic system of the Middle Age.*

We pass reluctantly over that portion of the work † containing the strikingly original and profound discussion of the earlier stages of religious development. The true representative of monotheism is in the Catholic system of the mediæval Church, with its eminent social vigor, and its singular efficacy as a political power. Here is precisely the point of advantage in this, as compared with the other two. The agency of the Roman hierarchy in constructing the fabric of European civilization is most satisfactorily shown. Its capital characteristic, as distinguished from earlier systems, was *the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers*, which the intellectual strength of antiquity was vainly spent in the endeavour to combine. ‡ Hence the possibility of a system uniting so various nations and manners; and the magnificent compass of that embrace which as easily took in the new continent of America, as upheld the old organization of Europe. Its inherent weakness and insufficiency (which, on the other hand, lost to it from the first Byzantium and the East) were not from fault in the organization, but from the defect of the fundamental idea,—from the “vague and arbitrary character of theological beliefs.” While the doctrine was held with firm conviction, its social office was abundantly fulfilled. In its conflict with the political power, it stood strictly on the defensive.

* To judge then fairly, he says, we should “almost indifferently transfer our thoughts to all degrees of the theological scale, without any disturbing predilection.” Vol. V. p. 52. This, of course, can only be done by that school, which is “equally disengaged from monotheistic beliefs as from polytheistic or fetichistic” (Ibid. p. 325); viz. by the “positive” school, of which, he somewhere takes occasion to tell us, he is at present the sole representative.

† Lectures LII. and LIII., Vol. V. pp. 1–296.

‡ The defeat of Arianism, as the state party, is, we suppose, to be regarded as the vindication of this essential idea of Catholic Christianity.

This, too, was the character of the great religious wars waged under its auspices: the Crusades were neither aggressive, nor without success.* Its doctrine and discipline were by no means arbitrary, but essential to its efficiency. Hence we must justify its institution of celibacy and confession, its claim of local sovereignty (though at the temporary political sacrifice of Italy), the "fundamental dose of Polytheism" which it was obliged to retain, and the dogmas of original sin and exclusive salvation in its doctrinal system, — though, indeed, "the obligation to damn Homer, Aristotle, Archimedes, etc., must surely have been very painful to all Catholic philosophers; still, it was strictly necessitated by the imperfect nature of the system." † Faith became the first of duties, and the basis of all morality. ‡ And nobly, in the emancipation of the class of slaves, in the conduct of general education "by those modest masterpieces of common philosophy which made up the substance of the vulgar catechism," in its assiduous culture of domestic morals, and in the steady development of modern industry, did the Church vindicate its title to the spiritual direction of mankind. §

Catholicism occupied ten centuries — from Paul to Hildebrand — in its doctrinal and ecclesiastical development; it continued in full vigor for less than two. Its decline dates from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The function of a priesthood, including the active administration of social rule, can never engage the highest intellects as a class. There is an essential want of harmony and sympathy between such minds and the personal interests and small details which occupy the governing order. In the period of its healthy and normal activity, the Church adopted and fostered the intellectual culture of the age, and by a wise policy secured to itself that adventitious influence which comes of the popular respect for mind. But it had fatally committed itself to dogmas and decrees having their fitness only for the past, which the human reason must soon outgrow. Rising heresies it put down at first with a strong hand, and easily; then came the period of tyranny and spasmodic

* Vol. V. p. 404.

† Ibid. p. 378.

‡ Ibid. p. 440.

§ Lecture LIV., Vol. V. pp. 297 – 491.

effort; and the mendicant orders of preachers came forward to turn the current of men's thought, and get up a counter excitement, and deprive heresy of its breath.* But the culture which the Church had nurtured became too large for its compass. Scholasticism and the universities first undermined the intellectual basis of its supremacy.† Metaphysical adroitness and ethical casuistry managed to disguise the appearance of dissent; and with prodigious effort the elements of future dissolution were retained in nominal allegiance. But perpetual compromise did its work. The Church found its lofty function gradually reduced to the task of self-preservation and the office of preaching. It had lost the prestige of intellectual superiority, and with it that grand power of organization and centralization, as extended once over the "European Synergy" of states. Henceforth the several state-monarchies retained whatever of that organic force was left.‡ And these contained the elements of their own decline: for when the political power of the Popes became a shadow, and their consecration was no longer of any account, the royalty in turn was undermined by its own victory, and lost its hold on the religious reverence of the people. The phrase "Catholic Majesty" remained; but the thing it signified was rapidly passing away.§

So passed the first great period of the disorganization of the mediæval system, — while the Church still retained its outward unity, and the elements of its dissolution were within. With the sixteenth century began a new period. A revolutionary spirit was at work in every Catholic country, — in some leading to open secession, in others working more secretly, to this day. The three centuries which followed have been a period of rapid and visible decomposition. Luther, Calvin, and Socinus represent the protest made respectively against the discipline, the hierarchy, and the doctrine of the Church: the third marks the transition from the theological to the deistic epoch. The prestige and authority of the Church were gone. Its active energies were wielded by the voluntary association of the Jesuits; which declined to the lamentable condition of "a sort of universal mystification,

* Vol. V. p. 510.

† Ibid. p. 578.

‡ Ibid. p. 555.

§ Ibid. p. 569.

in which each should be at once, and for the same purpose, both cheat and dupe." So the spiritual power changed hands, and lost respect. Catholicism became servile, and deserted its former noble mission, to vindicate the popular liberty and right.* The grand organization of Christianity degenerated into "that multitude of heterogeneous sects, of which each held the one before it in pity, and the one after it in abhorrence, according to the greater or less decomposition of their theological system.†" Hence, in Protestant countries especially, an affected horror of spiritual power, an unjust scorn of the Middle Ages, and an absurd admiration of polytheistic antiquity. Hence, too, a growth of more dangerous sophisms and fallacies: the idea that social wants are to be met by mere change of laws; the tendency to a "metaphysical theocracy," in the "reign of virtue," which would be nothing but the inauguration of cant; the selfish and benevolent schools of ethics, — respectively "ignorant cynicism" and "systematized hypocrisy"; vain reverence for the "metaphysical abstraction of Law," made up of "a chaos of judicial decisions"; the subjection of the spiritual to the temporal power, — religion, education, and morals being (especially in Protestant countries) under the patronage of the ruling class; the depravation of moral taste, as seen in the "Pucelle" of Voltaire and the "Confessions" of Rousseau; and the final stage of Atheism, with its crowning abstraction of "Nature," its vague worship of "a goddess instead of a God," and its complete dissolution of the fabric of men's thought and morals, — a dissolution which the Church was utterly powerless to prevent.‡

Meanwhile, a "unanimous, instinctive movement of reorganization," dating as far back as the formation of the European system under Charlemagne, continued in the emancipation of labor under the auspices of the Church, and receiving its final stimulus from the great inventions and discoveries of the fifteenth century, § had developed in ample shape and proportion the reconstructive agencies of society. Its evolution had gone hand in hand with the earlier steps of positive science. Albertus

* Vol. V. p. 567; Vol. VI. p. 133.

† Vol. V. pp. 661 and 693.

‡ Lecture LV., Vol. V. pp. 492–775.

§ Vol. V. pp. 411, 467, and Vol. VI. pp. 46, 104.

Magnus, Roger Bacon, Galileo, Copernicus, and Newton represent the several stages of that evolution. A "sort of new faith" in scientific methods and principles sprang up, taking the place, by degrees, in men's minds, of their waning theological belief. The essential integrity of the human mind was admirably shown in "the universal adoption of the twofold motion of the earth, a century before the Papacy, by a needless inconsistency, had at last solemnly tolerated its Christian admissibility." Herein was involved greater intellectual revolution than in any other single step of mental progress. "A doctrine as old as our mind, directly established on the strongest testimony of the most constant phenomena, intimately bound up with the whole system of ruling opinions and the general interest of existing powers, one to which the pride of man lent an instinctive support in the secret of each individual consciousness,"* was peaceably overthrown; and the supremacy of science in the realm of thought was definitely established. The great controversy of Nominalist and Realist was "the inevitable struggle of the positive spirit against the metaphysical"; as the so-called science of Natural Theology had exhibited "the contradictory dualism then established [by the schoolmen] between the old idea of God and the new entity of Nature,—the respective centres of the theological and metaphysical philosophy."† Society and politics, too, became the subject of philosophic discussion, though as yet only in a provisional way, and by means of a "dispersive empiricism."‡ Labor began to be more completely organized. Machinery superseded a large portion of human toil; and the condition of the popular masses grew to be the great political problem of modern times. "Throughout the great European commonwealth, the happy preliminary development of the new social element has constituted, since the Middle Age, a universal movement of partial recomposition, destined to concur with the simultaneous movement of political decomposition, so as, by their inevitable combination, to give birth to the final regeneration of humanity."§

But the destructive and reproductive agencies accom-

* Vol. II. p. 171.

† Vol. VI. pp. 315, 328.

‡ Vol. VI. p. 91.

§ Lecture LVI., Vol. VI. pp. 1 - 343.

panied each other with unequal steps. The old system hastened to its fall; the new came but slowly to take its place. Hence that great revolutionary crisis, wherein "a deliberate experiment should display the organic impotence of the *critical* principle, which had presided in the decomposition of the old system." * Its premonitory symptoms were, the abolition of the Order of Jesuits, the financial reforms of Turgot, and the American Revolution. Destitute alike of doctrine and purpose, conceiving of society "as indefinitely abandoned, without any independent impulse of its own, to the interminable succession of vain constitutional essays," the negative and critical philosophy, represented by pedantic and legal formalists, assumed the empire of misrule. "The audacious legal suppression of Christianity signally displayed both the caducity of an organization which had at last become essentially foreign to modern life, and the need of a new spiritual order capable of directing fitly the regeneration of humanity." The strenuous and apt policy of the "Convention" saved France from the imminent peril (induced by the guilty incapability of the Girondist party) of being severed into petty states.† The fall of Robespierre was "the first decisive symptom of the inevitable decline of a disastrous policy, which, in spite of the most horrid excesses of exceptional proceedings, could succeed only in organizing a complete retrogradation." With him, however, (representing the *deistical* or *religious* party of the revolutionists,) had begun a reaction, which was continued in the "reëstablishment of monarchy, under a vain imperial disguise," by Bonaparte, — "a man almost an alien to France, coming from a backward state of civilization, and especially animated, under the secret impulse of a superstitious temperament, by an involuntary admiration of the old social hierarchy; while the measureless ambition which devoured him was really, notwithstanding his vast characteristic charlatanism, associated with no eminent mental superiority, except what is found in his undeniable talent for war, much more akin, especially in our day, with moral energy, than with intellectual

* Vol. VI. p. 346. It was the fulfilment of the political dream of the Greek philosophers. See Vol. V. p. 263.

† Vol. VI. p. 376.

force.* Then came the restoration of monarchy, with no nobler pretension than to keep the peace; the professed government of interests, so different from the revolutionary heroism; the rise of journalism; the increasing decline of the Church, its ranks "more and more recruited among inferior natures"; the immense military police, or standing army; and, along with a new industrial development, the greater imminency of the social problem, and the greater need of reconstruction.†

What is needed now is the due combination of elements already existing. No true "spiritual power" is at present recognized. To rehabilitate the old Catholicism is utterly out of the question. Perpetual controversy has consumed the vitality and social efficiency of religious beliefs. A political solution of the difficulty is no solution at all. The true foundation of authority must be "the confidence spontaneously reposed in intellectual and moral superiority." All that prevents the scientific world from occupying the noble position of leading in the social regeneration is the want of decision and breadth of view among those who constitute it. The difficulty it may find will be from within; as with Hildebrand, in his construction of the Catholic system.‡ But there is every need that the effort should be made; and that henceforth the conduct of education and the welfare of the laboring orders (now abandoned by "the Church") should be assumed as the especial charge and commission of science. Its special office is, "to carry good common sense into every subject accessible to human reason." A direction should be given to the popular demands, moral rather than political. The stewardship of wealth, the right to education and employment, are to be enforced. And this new spiritual power, which must needs gain the popular allegiance and assent, will speedily have to interfere, to reconcile dissensions that might be fatal. The following is the language in which M. Comte heralds, six years in advance, the recent shocks in the European system:—

"In the painful collisions, inevitably preparing for us through the existing anarchy, under the ready excitement of hateful passions and subversive social dreams (*utopies*), the true philoso-

* Vol. VI. p. 386.

† Vol. VI. pp. 344–489.

‡ Vol. VI. p. 453.

VOL. L. — 4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. II.

phers, who shall have foreseen them, will be already prepared duly to derive from them the great social lessons which they should offer to all; thus showing to either side the inevitable insufficiency of purely political measures for the true end they respectively have in view, — the one as to progress, the other as to order, — the common realization of which must now depend on a total reorganization, first and above all *spiritual* [intellectual and moral]. The fatal infirmity of our nature, intellectual or affective, obliges us perhaps to regard these unhappy conflicts as alone able to compel upon all, and chiefly the class in power, a conviction so indispensable, and yet so opposed by all the habits and inclinations now prevalent. We may at least affirm, that, if these storms can really be averted, it can only be by means of a vast systematic development of the true philosophical action, whose social advent is, on the contrary, blindly repulsed in our day by statesmen of all parties. Bonaparte miserably let go the happiest possible occasion of thus preparing for the future: it is scarce likely that there will arise hereafter any temporal power, personal or collective, competent to repair in this regard that stupendous error, which history doubtless will one day deplore, as most fatal to the whole modern evolution." — Vol. VI. p. 612.

To sum up rapidly the conclusion of this longest and perhaps most important chapter of his work: he vindicates the "new power" as effectual for the cause of order; claims its agency as superseding the old system of education; exhibits its points of contact and alliance with the several existing parties; and, after a digression on the study of "less advanced populations," proceeds to show the various degrees of preparation for the final reconstruction in the several European nations.* And, finally, as a first practical measure towards this end, he suggests the forming of an association, to be entitled the "Positive Committee of the West," — which would, doubtless, in course of time, lead to the establishment of a true international power.†

The remainder of the work, consisting of three closing lectures, is occupied with a more special exposition of the "positive" or scientific method as applying to the questions thus laid open, together with an elaborate comparison

* The order of their aptness for the "positive" condition is, 1. France, 2. Italy, 3. Germany, 4. England, and lastly, Spain. It is worthy of remark, that he regards the Catholic countries as more fully prepared for a general disavowal of all religion. Vol. VI. p. 631 *et seq.*

† Lecture LVII. Vol. VI. pp. 344–644.

of this with other methods, as to each particular point of application.* To notice this portion adequately would take up at least the limits of another article. We are happy in being spared that task, and in being able to refer our readers to the independent, yet consentaneous, elaboration of the same subject by Mill, in the closing chapters of his *Logic*.

The peculiar form of his negation of religious beliefs is that, we apprehend, by which M. Comte has been chiefly, if not altogether, known among the larger class of readers. Without concealing this, it has at the same time been our purpose to state his method and system as a whole, so as to give his special opinions that degree of perspective and relief which they have in his own mind. A position which exposes him to the virulent hostility of every known party should be examined (when held by an able and sincere man) with peculiar caution, and a desire to be scrupulously just. It is quite evident that he is not to be confounded in the charge of vulgar atheism; and that the commonplaces of natural theology are of very little service in considering his argument. It is evident, too, that he has elaborately studied and carefully weighed the *historical* significance of each principal phasis of theological opinion; and has sought, in his own fashion, to do ample justice to them all. And we think it will be allowed by those who have examined his work, that, for the clearness of appreciation with which he discerns the religious element in the forming period of human society, and for the breadth of vision and fertility of suggestion with which he surveys and describes the field of religious and philosophical history, he has no superior. No Catholic writer, not even Count de Maistre, has more ably set forth the constructive function of the Church; no man, not even Benjamin Constant, has more fully and justly represented the working of the religious element in the primitive era of the human race.

What, then, is the whole drift and tendency of his philosophy? To this we answer, that we have honestly

* As supplementary labors, M. Comte announces the following: — 1. *Philosophy of Mathematics*, 2 vols.; 2. *System of Social Philosophy*, 4 vols.; 3. *True Method of Positive Education*, 1 vol.; 4. *Action of Man upon the Natural World*, 1 vol. We are unaware that either of these projected works has yet been published.

✓ surrendered ourself to his influence, and weighed each suggestion that he has made, for the sake of testing, fairly as we might, the force he brought to bear. There is, doubtless, a widening and deepening and shifting of the perspective; but, as respects the essential elements of religious conviction, we do not find them altered or diminished. The fact is, the range of his argument, and the bearing of his thought, are mainly aside from what we have been accustomed to regard with most interest as our peculiar "theological" domain. So that his arguments, if so they may be called, aimed at religious ideas themselves, or the objects of them, simply "pass by us as the idle wind, which we regard not." We can accept in good faith his immense services, in the way of historical and scientific criticism, and social philosophy, without being in the least disturbed by the fact that he is an "infidel," and that he ignores utterly what to us is sacred and cherished truth. We will state more explicitly what we mean.

In the first place, it is the *social* application and efficacy of the religious idea, which alone concerns his philosophic view; i. e. his first business is to discard a theological basis for the reconstruction of the social system. Thus, in what is the real drift and essential application of his doctrine, we have no quarrel with him; for it is only the position which our national constitution (as opposed to the British) has sanctioned, and which the American people, Catholics and all, have ratified with one accord.

✕ In the next place, as long as his philosophy is true to its legitimate function, it does not invade directly the province of religious faith. With the private opinions of M. Comte the non-believer in Christianity, or in any religion at all, we have simply nothing to do: in his philosophy, as expounder of science, history, and society, we can take unalloyed satisfaction, quite independent of those opinions. For his system, it will be observed, is essentially *negative*, not *privative*, as to religious ideas. ✕ It *ignores*, but on its own principles it cannot *deny*. He repudiates the name atheist or materialist as distinctly,* as he would that of religionist disdainfully. If he de-

* Vol. V. p. 539, note; also, Vol. VI. p. 846.

clares to be "absolutely inaccessible and void of sense for us the investigation of what are called *causes*, original or final," we certainly are not bound to trouble ourselves about "the cause of this defect," or to account for the mental idiosyncrasy. As to the proposition that *there is no God*—i. e. no shaping and governing Intellect, no wise forethought, no parental care—in the universe, we cannot possibly put it in such shape that it should ever present a question to be discussed. Utterly perplexed and embarrassed at finding such a mind as Comte's preferring to consider every subject *as if there were no God*, and even engaged in special pleading here and there to refute the ideas which connect themselves with the belief in a Deity (for which he considers that the idea of Humanity is a more than ample substitute),* we can only think that there is perhaps something hopelessly at fault in the statement of the question,—possibly, in every statement of it that can be made by the human mind. What interests us, therefore, is not to answer set arguments, for of these he offers none; but to conjecture, if we can, what the state of mind may be which chooses negation before belief. The influences which may have set that way, we think have been sufficiently indicated in the foregoing pages.

Still further: an admission, of the utmost moment as it seems to us, is made by him perpetually, in the very substitutes he offers from time to time, to supersede our religious notions. Thus he considers that the science of Astronomy has substituted for the old doctrine of final causes the conception of *conditions of existence*, "whose scope and fruitfulness are far superior."† He is also at pains to explain facts seemingly exceptional into conformity with the true law of human development, so as to prove the existence of more goodness and wisdom in the universe than we had supposed. He insists that human society is by the same fundamental law in every case the best that the conditions will admit;‡ and cer-

* Vol. VI. p. 691.

† Vol. II. p. 40. Also, p. 172. "For the fantastic and enervating idea of a universe arranged for man, we substitute the real and living conception of man, discovering by positive exercise of his intellect the true general laws of the world." Also, Vol. III. p. 460.

‡ Vol. IV. p. 387; also, *Ibid.* pp. 195, 587.

tainly implies some corresponding thought, in each instance where he employs his favorite phrase. It is almost needless to say, that it is precisely this tendency, this effort, this vitality, this seizing on every occasion to secure the most favorable result, which to us is the agency of Providence, and the beneficent power of God. To the theist doctrine, as to that of negation, there is the sphere of metaphysical necessity: only to the one it represents a holy Will; to the other, a bare, immutable Fact. But when the Fact becomes a Law, a Tendency, a conscious Purpose, and a Life, then to us it necessarily becomes Divine.* On the whole, as the basis of a religious conception, we like the phrase "conditions of existence" decidedly better than the older and narrower one.

The simple fact is, that M. Comte ought to have restricted himself to his legitimate office, which is, to expound the true function and place of science, and the strictly scientific or social bearings of religious opinions. A theological opinion may be irrelevant, or obscure, or doubtful, or feebly held, or inconsistently stated, or violently contested; and for any or all these reasons, it may be unfit to serve as a basis for political combinations, and so to play a part in the future social evolution of mankind. So far he has a right to go; but no farther. The office of science is to expound to us the laws of that metaphysical necessity of which we spoke. As he well says,† it seeks "not causes, but relations"; it is "the statement of law, not of facts." So far forth as science, it doubtless has nothing to do with the religious interpretation of the law. In its processes, it must deal with facts strictly as if there were nothing beyond. It must "know,

* We are sorry to be obliged to notice, in this connection, the weakness and futility of the direct attempts of M. Comte to assail the religious admiration with which unsophisticated men regard the adaptations of the outward world, and the provisions of natural life. Thus (Vol. II. p. 37) he is at pains to disparage the arrangement of the solar system, apparently for no reason at all. So also (Vol. III. pp. 462, 729) he assures us that the functions of the eye, the bladder, and the motive apparatus are not quite what they should be: and again (Vol. VI. p. 881), that artificial works are in their way decidedly better than the natural. We will just mention, also, in this place, his allusion to the resigned and cheerful suicide of Condorcet (Vol. IV. p. 262), as an example of resignation quite equal to any of the boasts of Christian endurance. It is to be observed, by the way, that no allusion is made to the theological argument from comparative anatomy in its connection with palæontology, and that the latter science is not recognized at all.

† Vol. VI. pp. 701, 703.

in order to foreknow"; it must shift the conditions, so as to watch the change wrought in the result. To foresee or control the phenomena, M. Comte thinks, is destructive of any religious understanding of them. What sort of Divine agency would he have? Should Providence act capriciously? * If the necessity is in the direction of wisdom and goodness (as he contends), it is so far an extension of our religious conception, and a progress in our idea of God. But with the previous opinion, that the Necessity is the Life or Will or Agency of Deity, there is nothing in the range of his lawful science which can come near to damage it.

And still further, let us consider that enlargement of the domain of law, which it is the especial purpose of this treatise to expound. It signifies, simply, that the same sovereignty is over men and nations as over things. Behind the strifes and crimes and calamities and revolutions of mankind, there is a region of fixed and immutable Necessity. This it is, which to us is the purpose or will of God. The grand general features of the world's history, taken in the mass, are the steps and indications of that sovereign Will. The law is not mechanical, but dynamic and vital. It works by living forces,—by creative and reproductive energies. When we submit ourselves in the last resort to its necessity, it is to a law of the same sort as that which the planets obey in their courses, the moon in her monthly round, the ocean's tidal swell, and the ripening fields of grain. It is to be taken for granted in what we think and do, just as the earth's revolution is allowed for in our observations of a planet's path; and no more than the general law of growth interferes with the special development of a plant after its kind, does this sovereign Necessity interfere with the free personality and moral liberty of man.† It marks out a plan or a pattern on a great scale, which each period or event in history contributes to fill out. It appoints those unvarying conditions of *permanence* and *average*, from which human conduct in the mass can never depart very far, and to which the return swing of the pendulum will presently bring it back. It sets the height of the middle

* The "possibility of arbitrary intervention" is the only essential idea which he allows modern theism to have retained. Vol. VI. p. 713.

† See "Christian Examiner" for May, 1846, Vol. V. of this Series, p. 346.

tide, which the perpetual ebb and flow may pass and re-pass for ever, without obliterating the metes and bounds, or contradicting that Eternal Word which says, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." It defines the point towards which human evolution is for ever tending, and foreordains the steps that conduct to it. All this, as we understand it, and are far from wishing to deny, illustrates the province and operation of Law, and as such is always open to be studied scientifically. But it also speaks to us of a Will behind that law. It is as essential to the providential as to the scientific interpretation of the history of mankind: and so science, in every conceivable stage of its development, can never be any thing else to us than an expounding of the principles of that "Art, whereby God made and governs the world."

This view, that Law is the working of an immutable Will, our author is pleased * to call "an ingenious artifice" of the schoolmen. To us it is the necessary modern transformation and interpretation of the equally necessary fundamental religious thought. By every test we have a right to apply, that thought is shown to be native and inalienable, — necessarily inwrought in the constitution of the human mind. It has survived every change of knowledge or belief; it survived that greatest of all intellectual revolutions, the accepted proof of the motion of the earth; it has only taken new shape and fresh impulse when compelled to shift its ground, without losing any thing of its vigor or its identity. As soon as any form of belief, any statement of science, becomes fixed and familiar, it is forthwith made the subject-matter of religious speculation, and the basis of a new religious conception. We have not been particularly impressed, ourselves, with the argument of Chalmers's "Astronomical Discourses," or Babbage's "Bridgewater Treatise," or the translucid speculations of "The Stars and the Earth." But all these have a significance far more important than their special trains of thought; which is, as illustrations of the proposition just stated. The religious mind transmutes the "fixed facts," of whatever order, into food and stimulus for its devotion, readily and easily as the sunlight trans-

* Vol. V. p. 712.

mates vague drifts of mist into vast fields flooded with glory. And we do not apprehend any possible form that may be given to human knowledge, which can alter this primary and unchanging fact in the constitution of the human mind. The "theological state" is not deserted and left behind, since no element of our culture ceases in its effect upon us; but is taken up and carried along with the progress of the mind, and made to harmonize with the successive stages of its development. M. Comte might have seen this fact, if he had attended more carefully and less scornfully to the course of thought in Protestant countries. Not to have seen it, involves what we must regard as a most unfortunate feature, if not a radical vice and fallacy, of his work.

We are the more interested in this argument, that the work we have been considering contains what is doubtless the ultimate form of religious unbelief. Already, as will have been seen, the current is turned; and from a blind and prejudiced hostility towards every religious conviction alike, the present phasis of denial accepts the historical significance of each, and its essential office in aid of human development. It is a calm, dispassionate, broad judgment, even if at times prejudiced and austere, which is brought to bear upon them. The utmost that can be said is, that science has completely driven off the officious interference of theology. It has vindicated its own mental independence, and its own sufficient basis. Henceforth, we shall hear of no such platitudes as the especially religious character of this or that science, or the ignorant marvel and reproach of religious men at the undevoutness of scientific men. The two departments of thought are likely to stand hereafter by their independent principles and their separate evidence. We think it is best they should. The processes of science were long enough cumbered with theological prejudice; and we have not to wonder if theology is now and then sued for arrears. It is useless to deny or overlook the evident fact, that, in the present condition of things, theology would be the worse sufferer in an open conflict. She need not supplicate for mercy; but she should calmly and patiently abide by her own ground. It may be, that for the guiding of the general thought, for hints of ethical doctrine, for maxims and grounds of intellectual certainty, for the

conditions of substantial well-being and social order, we must go first to the principles and methods of natural science, understood in its magnificent breadth and compass, as here defined. But theology can afford to yield gracefully, where she once ruled triumphantly. Knowledge and Faith will still as ever divide the broad firmament of human thought. Knowledge comprehends that which is within the visible horizon: Faith apprehends that which is beyond. The circle of the first may widen, and the boundaries of the other will be more remote. But nothing can effectually be lost or diminished from the Infinite. And Religion, as the inspiration of Thought, the soul of Goodness, and the light of Life, will hold its own.

J. H. A.

ART. III.—UNITARIANISM IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES.*

THE Rev. Robert Wallace, author of the work before us, after completing the regular course of study at Manchester College, York, commenced life in 1815 as a Unitarian clergyman in Chesterfield, whither he was invited by the congregation of Elder-Yard Chapel, previously under the pastoral care of the Rev. George Kenrick. From this place, where his services were highly valued, he was called in 1840 to fill the chair of Theology in the collegiate institution at Manchester. Here he labored for six years, enjoying the respect and love of all who knew him, and performing his duties to the entire satisfaction of the committee and the public, until the state of his health obliged him to relinquish his post for some less arduous work in a more agreeable atmosphere. Immediately on resigning his

* *Antitrinitarian Biography: or Sketches of the Lives and Writings of distinguished Antitrinitarians; exhibiting a View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship in the principal Nations of Europe, from the Reformation to the Close of the Seventeenth Century. To which is prefixed a History of Unitarianism in England during the same Period.* By ROBERT WALLACE, F. G. S., and member of the Historico-Theological Society of Leipzig. London: E. T. Whitfield. 1850. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. lxxx., 461, 590, 638.

professorship, he went to Bath, at the cordial invitation of the society worshipping in Trim Street Chapel; and here, after preaching nearly four years, his life was brought to a close, on the 13th of May, 1850, two months only after the publication of the "*Antitrinitarian Biography*." His career was uneventful. It was a life of plain, homely, diligent usefulness. His cast of mind was grave and inquiring; not imaginative, but fond of dry research, patient and persevering. In social disposition, he was mild, cheerful, and affectionate; not passionate or demonstrative, but genial and true. Mr. Wallace was no genius. He was nothing more than a hard, conscientious student in the learning of the past, candid, liberal, industrious, an old-fashioned searcher of the Scriptures, and content to get his truth from them. In his departments of study he became distinguished; for besides the honorable office he held at Manchester, he was a member of the Historico-Theological Society of Leipsic. For a modern clergyman Mr. Wallace was rather a voluminous author; writing not only upon theological, but also upon philological and scientific subjects. But he will be known mainly as a stout champion of Unitarianism: and here his fame will rest, as he desired it should, upon the book under review. At intervals, for twenty-four years, he toiled upon this work with most laudable devotedness. Still, it is but a fragment of what he originally designed to produce, and, we may add, of what he should have produced with his materials. Mr. Wallace at first proposed, as his preface informs us, "to point out the origin, and trace the gradual development of the doctrine of the Trinity; secondly, to produce testimonies of ante-Nicene writers to the supremacy of the Father; and thirdly, to give a series of biographical notices of those, who, since the general reception of the doctrine of the Trinity among Christians, have rejected or impugned that doctrine." But this original plan of the work was abandoned as too large. Then he thought he would deal only with the third division of his scheme, and would merely give an account of Antitrinitarians from the Christian Fathers of the fourth century to the present time. This outline again proving too comprehensive, he determined to commence with the Reformation. But even now, the task was heavier than he chose to undertake, and he finally concluded to cut off

the end of his story as well as the beginning, and to limit himself to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This and no more he has given us,—the memoirs, scanty enough too, of unobscure Unitarians, whether authors or not, who lived in a section of two hundred years. The materials of the book are derived mainly from the older works of Sandius, Bock, and Zeltner, and from the more modern ones of Trechsel and Illgen.* The method is essentially that of Sandius, chronological. Mr. Wallace has certainly spared no pains to make his book perfect according to his idea. It is sufficiently learned; evidence is accumulated upon every doubtful biographical or bibliographical point; there is a full catalogue of each author's writings, sometimes occupying more space than the account of his life and opinions. The disputed details of personal history are carefully dwelt upon. If one wishes to know about the Unitarianism of John Locke or Sir Isaac Newton, the authenticity of Milton's "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," or Calvin's treatment of Servetus, Mr. Wallace can tell him of such things. The volumes are very elaborately written; indeed, the language is so consciously precise as to be in some places obscure, and even incorrect. Scrupulous accuracy in reporting historical facts is the chief merit of the book. It is far from being interesting. It is dull and hard; not very nutritious. It is neither dramatic nor pictorial, as it might easily have been. It is not historical or philosophical, as it certainly ought to have been. It exhibits no unity or harmony of plan whatever. We have not here a connected history of the external fortunes of Unitarianism, unless the convenient Chronological Table prefixed to the first volume may be considered such. We are not told of its rise, its progress, and its extension, of its fate in different countries, of its advantages and disadvantages in respect to legal and social position, of the influences that favored or obstructed it, of its patrons, professors, or schools; in short, we have nothing like a comprehensive, historical view of the civil, social, and theological position of Unitarianism. Neither does Mr. Wallace give the internal history of Unitarianism. He should have told us

* Numerous other writings that treat of his subject in its general and particular aspects have been likewise faithfully consulted; and appended to each biography is a copious list of authorities, very valuable.

wherein it essentially differs from Romanism and from Protestantism; he should have traced along the development of its primal germs, and should have indicated the share which the most distinguished of his three hundred and sixty teachers had in unfolding and establishing the doctrine. Their place should have been assigned according to their position in the system they represented. Nothing of the kind has Mr. Wallace done. He gives us only a collection of articles placed in loose chronological juxtaposition, having no coherence of relation, circumstance, or thought. English, Polish, Swiss, Italians, Arians, Unitarians, Baptists, and Anabaptists, are ranged independently side by side, as in a Biographical Dictionary. His account of individual opinions is in some instances far from satisfactory. Even the views of such men as Michael Servetus and Faustus Socinus are stated in a doubtful and fragmentary way, by no means philosophical. For these reasons the book will not be entertaining, or even instructive, to the general reader; though as a compendium of knowledge for reference, as a dictionary of dates and authorities, as a digest of information, literary and biographical, collected from reliable and not very accessible sources, it will be valuable to the antiquarian and the student of religious literature. The most interesting part of these volumes is the last half of the "Historical Introduction," containing a sketch of Unitarianism in England. This portion is really entertaining. Mr. Wallace describes the controversy between Dr. Sherlock and Dr. South, and the controversy that grew out of Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity," simply by giving the titles of the pamphlets that appeared on either side, with the circumstances that called them forth, and occasional extracts exhibiting the line of argument and the tone of the discussion. We are thus made to sympathize with the spirit of the time. Local and personal allusions are explained. Here and there is a piece of curious information on a point of authorship. The old style of language, and the minute facts which are thrown in, give a better coloring to the sketch than any artistic grouping could have imparted.

One or two thoughts were suggested to us in reading of these older controversies in the seventeenth century. Both in substance and mode of reasoning they were strikingly

similar to that of our own time. The learning on either side was meagre; the acuteness very considerable; the sarcasm perhaps was more distinguished than either. As to the materials of the argument, they are as carefully gathered and as effectively used in those little, old-fashioned quarto volumes as in any of our modern lectures and tracts. Indeed, if it be profitable to publish any more in that vein, we should recommend the reprinting of several pamphlets once distinguished, now forgotten, and especially of one tract, published in 1695, entitled "A Discourse concerning the Nominal and Real Trinitarians." As to the manner of controversy, the advantage is decidedly with us. It is not customary for a disputant now to call his antagonist a "flourishing scribbler," an "undertaker," "egregious whiffler," "notorious dissembler," or, as Dr. Zwicker termed Dr. Bull, "bipedum ineptissimus." Tillotson, in one of his sermons "Concerning the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour," complimented the Socinians upon their fairness and courtesy in debate, calling them "the strongest managers of a weak cause, and which is ill-founded at the bottom, that perhaps ever meddled with controversy." The hottest dispute was between the Trinitarians themselves. The doctrine of Dr. Sherlock, that "there are three distinct, intelligent, infinite beings, minds, spirits, and persons, distinguished just as three finite created minds or spirits are, as really distinct as three men, or as Peter, James, and John," was censured by a decree passed in Convocation at Oxford, in 1695, as "false, impious, and heretical; at variance with and contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and especially to the commonly received doctrine of the English Church." Some were in favor of yet more violent measures towards the Tritheists. There was a strong smell of the fagot in "A Short History of Valentine Gentilis, the Tritheist, tried, condemned, and put to Death by the Protestant Reformed City and Church of Berne in Switzerland, for asserting the Three Divine Persons of the Trinity to be (Three Distinct, Eternal Spirits, &c.) Wrote in Latin, by Benedict Aretius, a Divine of that Church; and now translated into English for the Use of Dr. Sherlock; humbly tendered to the Consideration of the Archbishops and Bishops of this Church and Kingdom. London. 1696." (12mo.) Indeed, the Athanasians and the Sabellians,

the Arians and the Trinitarians, in the bosom of the Church, were so warmly engaged together, that the Unitarians were counselled to remain quiet, and let their adversaries devour each other. At this time, we are told that none of the Unitarians "had any set meetings for the propagation of their doctrines, as men of other persuasions had," but that they mingled with the established societies,—many of them being professed members of the Church of England, a few connecting themselves with the other religious bodies. They wrote for the most part anonymously, keeping their names so closely concealed that an orthodox writer confessed himself "a perfect stranger to them," knowing "nothing of the gentlemen but their books."

But we must come to the main design of the work before us; which is, to describe the position of Unitarianism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Upon this point we would offer a few remarks; not following Mr. Wallace, who leads us nowhere, who only takes three hundred and sixty leaps from the history of one individual to the history of another; but rather doing what Mr. Wallace does not, and attempting a brief sketch of Antitrinitarianism during those two hundred years.

Dissent from the Romish Church took manifold shapes, and appeared simultaneously in a great many places. At the commencement of the Reformation, the mass of theological opinion was huge, chaotic, shapeless; the germs of future opposing doctrines were there, but hardly distinguishable. All was fluctuating and ambiguous. The strangest combinations presented themselves. The ecclesiastical element was mingled with the political and social; theoretical and practical, rational and supernatural, mystical and intellectual, orthodoxy and heterodoxy, reformation and revolution, were confusedly grouped together, conscious as yet of no radical disagreement. The speculative reason, freed from its bondage, first by the gradual advance of philosophical thought, and finally by the open protest against church authority in matters of faith, naturally disported itself somewhat recklessly, and ran into extremes. Luther's Reformation had a practical aim; he protested against actually existing moral abuses; but the practical soon involved the speculative, and the bold stand of the true-hearted monk against wrong en-

couraged the numerous thinkers and doubters to speak their word against error. We are not surprised, therefore, to find Antitrinitarian sentiments more or less clearly defined, and involving to a greater or less degree the denial of kindred doctrines, prevailing in a wide circumference around the main centre of agitation. But a few localities were chiefly distinguished as seats of Unitarianism. Switzerland was one of these. Lewis Hetzer, the learned Biblical scholar, the liberal inquirer, the impetuous Reformer, John Denk, who was banished from Nuremberg, and James Kautz of Bockenheim, an enthusiastic young preacher, labored and suffered here. Hetzer was executed for blasphemy at Constance in 1529; Denk died at Basle of the plague a year earlier; and Kautz, his friend, preached against popular errors, heeding no opposition, until he was imprisoned at Strasburg. Switzerland, too, is the place where Michael Servetus met the awful fate of burning, at the instigation of Calvin. Servetus was the first man who made any thing like a systematic and many-sided attack upon the orthodox belief. His own views seem not to have been rigorously defined, for his deep religious feeling and his keen dialectical skill were often at variance, and between them both, his genuine talent for theological speculation was disturbed and misled. But his writings made a profound impression upon his age. Servetus was a noted man. Born in Spain, he early visited Basle and Strasburg and Lyons; he practised medicine in Paris, and afterward in the South of France; and he was on his way to Naples when the authorities arrested him at Geneva. In all these places he had friends. He was acquainted with leading Reformers in Germany and Switzerland, and was personally known to Calvin, with whom he corresponded, and whom he tried to engage in a public discussion. At the time of Servetus's death, Unitarianism had many adherents in Switzerland. Refugees from Italy, flying from the wrath of Rome, were seeking shelter in the tranquil neighbouring valleys where their brethren were assembled.

The principles of the Reformation early penetrated into Italy; they spread fast there, and struck deep root. Italy was the land of infidelity. There the abuses of the Church were the most outrageous and glaring. The re-

vival of classical learning, and the spirit of classical antiquity, never extinguished, were opening the eyes of men, and refining their taste so that the hollowness and immorality of the prevailing religion could neither be concealed nor palliated. But the Italian temper was not reformatory, and the power of the Church was despotic; accordingly, doubt in Italy, instead of calling forth protest, only led to indifference and contempt for all religion. The upper classes were atheistical, but loved their ease and privileges. The lower classes were atheistical, but destitute of culture. The Reformers were the educated of the middle class. These persons were at first distributed in many places; but gradually came together, drawn by their affinities, and formed the school at Vicenza. Of this school very little is known, nor is that little satisfactory. From the scanty notices of it, we can infer, however, that the tendency of speculation was very radical. The brethren; to the number of forty, — not all present at one time, and probably not all connected with the school at one time, — debated the high points of the Roman Catholic system, and especially the dogmas of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, satisfaction, and the rest, though probably after the manner of negation, and not from any positive philosophical basis of faith. There might have been other conclaves besides this one at Vicenza, but this one has become celebrated from its influence and the great names of its members. The duration of its existence also contributed to its fame. The brotherhood, by great secrecy, were able to escape the grasp of persecution until the middle of the sixteenth century. But at last they were discovered and compelled to flee; some were put to death in Venice, a few went into Asia, the remainder took refuge in Switzerland. And from this time Unitarianism began to separate itself from the other Protestant systems, and to assume an independent position. Many distinguished names are connected with this period of its history; among others those of Ochinus, Vergerius, Negri, Renatus, Blandrata, Gentilis, and Paul Alciati. Now likewise appears Lælius Socinus, who merits a word of special notice. Socinus did much to advance the Unitarian cause; not as an avowed champion, for he was timid, would not commit himself to any distinct propositions, evaded close questioning, urged his doubts hypothetically, and had no

mind to be a martyr; not as a systematic thinker, for although he possessed considerable subtilty of mind, and pushed his skepticism far, even to the point of doubting the Trinity, Satisfaction, Justification, the Sacraments, the Resurrection of the Body, and other matters whereof to doubt was perilous, he nevertheless at intervals hesitated, retracted, and held his views loosely. But as a man of education and birth, diligent, enthusiastic, and able, of large acquaintance and ubiquitous presence, Lælius made his influence felt. He studied the Bible earnestly when a mere boy, and even then doubted. In 1546, although but twenty-one years of age, we find him at Venice and Vicenza. Driven from his home (he was a Tuscan by birth), he passed some months in the Grisons with Camillus Siculus; in Geneva he cultivated the friendship of Calvin and Beza; he labored in France; at Basle he was acquainted with Munster and Castalio; at Zurich he lived with Pellican; at Wittemberg, he was intimate with Melancthon; he travelled in Poland and Moravia, interesting himself everywhere in religious inquiries, and finally died peacefully at Zurich in 1562. His ideas were more mighty in his successors, especially in his nephew Faustus, than they were in him.

Before the death of Lælius Socinus, Unitarianism was dying out in Switzerland. The extreme violence of the Calvinistic Reformers, the want of compactness among the Unitarians themselves, for as yet they had no common bond but the very loose one of dissent, and the fact that they were identified with the unpopular creed of the Anabaptists, conspired to break up their security, and when Valentine Gentilis was put to death at Berne in 1566, the storm of indignation was not so violent as it had been when Servetus was burned.

We hear no more of Socinianism in Switzerland. We must next follow it to Poland, whither the wanderers chiefly betook themselves. At this time circumstances favored the establishment of Protestantism in Poland. The princes of that country were at least tolerant. Sigismund the First, in 1534, was persuaded to issue an edict prohibiting the Polish youth from visiting foreign universities which were infected with heresy; but the edict was a dead letter, and in 1543 was formally abrogated by the Imperial Diet at Krakow. Sigismund the Second, who

reigned from 1548 to 1572, vacillated in his religious principles. Convinced of the radical corruption of the Romish Church, but at the same time placing little confidence in Protestantism, he exhibited through the whole of his life an uncertain mind. But on the whole, his policy favored the Unitarians. He restrained the Romanists, telling them, if their cause was good, to sustain it by argument, not by stripes. He allowed Protestants their religious freedom. The Senate, most of whom were adherents of the new doctrines, more than coöperated with the king. But the Reformation in Poland owed its strongest support to the nobles. They were a wealthy, privileged, independent, and powerful class, exercising all but sovereign authority on their own estates, and possessing the right by law of adopting such form of household religion as seemed to each best, provided only the Bible was assumed as its basis. They were, moreover, educated, intellectually daring, and bitterly opposed to the priesthood of Rome. Their own visits to foreign countries, and their familiar contact with foreign scholars, who sought refuge among themselves, afforded them the best opportunities for becoming acquainted with the finest thought of their age; and these opportunities were improved. Indeed, Krasinski tells us that, even in Paris, the nobles who went as ambassadors to inform Henry of Anjou of his election to the throne, as successor of Sigismund, excited universal admiration by their learning and culture. These men sympathized with the most liberal ideas of the Reformers, both on their speculative and their practical side, and especially were they inclined to the Unitarians as patrons of polite learning.

In Poland, too, after 1539, the press was free. About the middle of the sixteenth century, Prince Nicholas Radzivil established a printing-press at Brest in Lithuania, where a translation of the whole Bible in Polish was printed. Later, there was a large printing establishment at Rakow, which issued some of the writings of Faustus Socinus. When now to the immense benefit of a free press is added the impotence of the Roman clergy, and the tolerance, as yet, of the Protestant ministers, sufficient cause is assigned for the success of Unitarianism in Poland. Thither flocked the exiles from Switzerland and Italy, making their headquarters at Pinczow, whence

their name Pinczovians. For ten years they remained without disturbance within the pale of the Reformed Church, freely prosecuting their inquiries. Gonesius wrote boldly against the Trinity, and assailed the doctrine of Infant Baptism. Blandrata insisted that only the language of Scripture should be used in speaking of God and Christ. Francis Stancarus taught that Christ mediated only as a man. Gregory Pauli publicly preached against the preëxistence of Jesus. Peter Statorius said that the Holy Ghost was only the power of God's grace in the soul. This freedom by and by alarmed the orthodox Reformers, and it was not long before the Unitarians became a distinct church, known as the *ecclesia minor*. From this time the development of their doctrine was more rapid; but its advance was irregular and confused. They disputed among themselves. They were rent by internal controversies upon essential points of faith. They were under no authority, and they possessed no common principles of truth. They were an unorganized band of dissenters. At this juncture Faustus Socinus appears, and introduces a new era in the history of Unitarianism. The floating elements are combined into a system. The loose fragments that compose Unitarianism are worked up into a whole, which is for a time to be called Socinianism.

Faustus Socinus spent his life in organizing the Anti-trinitarians, a work for which he was peculiarly qualified. He was of noble descent, being connected on his mother's side with the ancient and famous family of Piccolomini, while by marrying the daughter of Christopher Merstinus he became related to the chief nobility of Poland. To this very powerful influence of family, he added that of a subtle, laboring, versatile, and ready mind, a charming disposition, and an agreeable manner. He was enthusiastic and patient; not a man of deep religious feeling, — no mystic, no profound philosopher, — rather a dialectician and moralist; a dissector and compounder of creeds, not a revealer of spiritual truth; a man of keen intellect, rather than of lofty soul, not, properly speaking, a genius, but still a man thoroughly convinced of the importance of his work, and pursuing it with a single purpose. His external circumstances likewise aided him in the part he was to fulfil, by offering the necessary field for

his talents. His parents died young, and he accordingly received but an indifferent education. He learned nothing of philosophy or of scholastic theology, very little of polite literature; he had only the rudiments of Logic. "God," he tells us, "was his only teacher, and the Holy Word." His active, bright mind was early directed towards religious and theological questions, under the influence of his uncle Lælius. At the age of twenty he was exiled from Italy. He went to Lyons and was studying there when his uncle's death called him to Zurich to take possession of his papers. Twelve years now, passed at Florence with the Grand Duke, gave to his mind that easy refinement which proved so serviceable in his later intercourse with men, and ripened his intellect to maturity. While living at the court, the impulse to theological inquiry, the craving of an insatiable doubt, seized him with irresistible force. He could not remain in Italy with his opinions; and nothing was left but to sacrifice the honors and pleasures of a courtier, wealth, prospects, and friends, to the demand of conviction. He took up his residence in Basle, where he spent four years elaborating his system, and discussing it. At this period, he published two of his most remarkable works. While thus employed, he was called aside by Blandrata, to engage in controversy with that party among the Unitarians who refused worship to Christ; and henceforward we see him fearless and untiring, laboring to heal the divisions that rent asunder his brethren.

Socinus was at issue with the Unitarians on many points. They would not admit him to their fellowship because he refused to be baptized anew. Besides his rejection of Anabaptism, some objected to his theory of the Atonement, his view of the Lord's Supper, and his explanation of the seventh chapter of Romans. Others repudiated his doctrine of the Holy Spirit, or looked blank at his denial of eternal damnation. The Arians found fault with his belief concerning Preëxistence; and the Humanitarians opposed him of course for teaching the worship of Christ. Nevertheless, Faustus Socinus was not to be deterred from devoting all his strength to the cause of Unitarianism. He labored, by speech and writing; he instructed, exhorted, disputed, attended synods, issued epistles, never losing sight of his leading object,

and even when he failed to convince, demanding still, and securing, a charitable tolerance of opinion. And to him was granted the satisfaction near the close of his life of seeing the fruit of his toil. He procured uniformity on the main points of his system. His liberal view of Baptism prevailed at a synod in Rakow, convened in 1603, the year before his death. The Budnæans, or disciples of Simon Budnæus, who contended that Jesus Christ was born in the ordinary mode of generation, and was therefore no object of divine homage, had lost their influence in Poland. In Lithuania, a synod assembled at Nowogrodek, in 1600, solemnly asserted the necessity of offering worship to Christ. At the same time, the Arian party were decreasing in numbers and weight.

To accomplish all this Socinus labored within the circle of Unitarianism. But to that circle his labors were by no means limited. He engaged both Protestants and Romanists in controversy, issuing works of an apologetic and polemical kind with extraordinary rapidity and power. And while his mind seemed to be thus continually abroad, he was also a close student of the Bible. In 1602, though suffering from a disease of the eyes, he dictated a translation of the Sermon on the Mount. At about the same period, he composed his Commentary upon the First Epistle of John. The "*Prælectiones Theologicæ*," an unfinished work, published after his death, containing an exposition of the prominent doctrines of the Socinian creed, belongs likewise to this time. With all this, he carried on an extensive correspondence, being in constant communication with the leaders and churches of Antitrinitarian faith.

In 1583 Socinus left Krakow, which had been his home for four years, apprehending personal danger. From this time, he was to see many dark days. He was married, but soon after the birth of his daughter lost his wife. He was seized with a dangerous illness. His friend, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, dying, he was deprived of the income from his Italian estates, — long threatened, but secured to him hitherto by Isabella Medici and her brother. These successive disappointments he bore with the utmost patience; not resigning himself to grief, but comforting his heart with the work he had set before him. After a retirement of two years he returned to Krakow,

but not to enjoy tranquillity there. Since the death of Sigismund the Second, in 1572, the prospects of Protestantism in Poland had been sadly overcast. The Roman party recovered itself, and commenced the old battle anew. It is true that, at the Imperial Diet of Warsaw, Protestantism obtained a full recognition before the law. The intrigues of Henry of Valois came to nothing. Stephen Bathory confirmed the religious liberty of the Reformed Churches. Fortune, nevertheless, was adverse to them. The Jesuits were invited to the realm, and as soon as they appeared, distrust began to alienate the Confessions from each other. The Society of Jesus labored incessantly, and having complete sway over the young king, Sigismund the Third, found little difficulty in executing their plans. The Protestants were gradually removed from posts of influence; offices of emolument and dignity were offered to all who would return to the Church; the populace even were instigated to acts of violence against the dissenters. In many places, Protestant churches and schools were demolished, and professors exposed to violent ill-treatment. Seldom were the rioters punished; for their supporters and abettors were powerful. The rights and privileges of Protestants were entirely disregarded; and, worse still, the popular spirit was embittered and filled with the bigot's wrath. From the fury of this persecution Socinus did not escape. Upon Ascension Day, 1598, as he lay sick upon his bed, a crowd of Krakovian students rushed into his dwelling, seized his papers, and dragged him half naked through the streets, amid the yells of an infuriated mob. His books they burned in the public square, and, as their smoke ascended, menaced him with the same fire in case he did not retract. But Socinus undismayed cried out, "I retract not; what I have been, I am, and will be to my last breath; do what God permits you." Then went up a shout of rage. A hasty counsel was taken. It was concluded to throw the infidel into the Vistula. Already was the procession moving, when the cries and hurrying of feet called to the window a professor in the University. He stopped the throng, rebuked them, saved the victim from their hands, sheltered him, and gave him refreshment. That same night Socinus left Krakow by stealth, never to reside there again. The remaining six years of his life he

passed mostly at Luclavice, a little village in the vicinity. Here he labored as severely as ever, and here he died in peace, at the age of sixty-five. The object of his life was fulfilled. He had impressed upon an age of intolerance the principles of charity and brotherly love. He had vindicated the right of private thought. This was his service to Protestantism. He established unity of faith among the Socinians. This was his service to Unitarianism. Immediately after his death appeared the Rakovian Catechism. This expressed the life and thought of Faustus Socinus. It is the result of his energetic doing. He commenced the Catechism with the aid of his friend Statorius, in the latter years of his life, and left it unfinished. Statorius carried on the work while he lived, and at his death Valentin Schmaltz, Moskorzowski, and Völkel completed it. In 1605, the Catechism, which was grounded on the writings of Socinus, was published at Rakow, in Polish, with a smaller catechism for children. In 1608 a German translation appeared, dedicated to the University of Wittemberg. And in 1609 Moskorzowski dedicated a Latin version to James the First of England. A second edition, enlarged and improved, was issued at Amsterdam by Wissowaty and Stegmann in 1665. The third and fourth editions were printed at Amsterdam also, in 1680 and 1684.

In the preface to the second edition, the publishers took pains to state that the Catechism was not designed as a rule of faith. After urging against other Confessions, that they bind men's consciences, impose a yoke upon Christian people, make them swear by another's word and thought, and pronounce malediction upon all who vary from the rule by a hair's breadth, they go on to declare, — "Far from us be such a sense, or rather such a nonsense. We write a Catechism, but prescribe nothing; we express our views, but we oppress no other man's." Something better than this was written in the preface to the amended edition. A really noble passage it is. "We see no cause to blush that our Church has advanced. We disregard the loud arrogance which cries, 'I stand here: here my foot is planted, not to be removed.' The Stoic may hold every point fast, and abide perversely by the doctrine he has propounded; but it becomes a Christian philosopher, who is the disciple of that wisdom

which cometh from above, to be open to conviction, and ready to make concessions, if a better truth offers."

Socinus left the mark of a powerful individuality upon the Protestantism of his age; but he did not work single-handed. Many brave fellow-laborers had he, learned, eloquent, and sympathetic. But of these we cannot speak. Unitarianism culminated for the time in Socinus. We have now only to say a few words of its local decline.

Socinianism never possessed the popular mind in Poland. It found most of its disciples among the nobility and higher classes, who were prepared for it by their intellectual culture. Its very adoption by these was of itself enough to keep it from the common people, for between the upper and lower orders a great gulf was fixed. The former were refined, wealthy, learned, aristocratic, despotic. The latter were sensual, poor, ignorant, almost enslaved. While the Unitarians were Anabaptists, they found sympathy with the masses. But when Socinus had purged away Anabaptism, the popular element in his system was destroyed. Socinianism belonged to the nobles. This fact explains at once its rapid growth in extent and influence, and its equally rapid decline. The nobility could make Unitarianism respectable; but in the time of danger they were of all most exposed to the influences which were brought to bear upon the extreme Protestants, and to the temptations liberally offered to the Roman Catholic converts.

The Jesuits ruled in Poland, — ruled the populace and the king. In 1627 they succeeded in breaking up the Church in Lublin, one of the principal Unitarian communions. But this was only preliminary to an attack upon Rakow. Rakow was the peculiar seat of Socinianism, and the most eminent literary centre in Poland. It was founded by John Siennynski, a Protestant, in 1569, and distinguished exiles were at once attracted thither by the promise of liberty. Convocations met there; and in 1600 Jacob Siennynski established the school whose fame reached far beyond the borders of Poland. At this "Gymnasium" were taught the higher branches of philosophy and theology; from its printing-press were issued the most noted books of the time. It was under the patronage of the first Socinian nobles, and was called the Athens of Sarmatia. Here preached Ostorodt, Statorius,

Schmalz, the Lubieneckis, Schlichting, and others. Here taught Borraüs, Crell, Ruarus, Adam Franck, Joachim and Lorenzo Stegmann. Under such auspices the school at Rakow acquired an extraordinary fame. In its palmy days it numbered a thousand students, of whom three hundred were of the nobility. Here Evangelicals and Papists studied by the side of Unitarians and Anabaptists. There was no distinction of creed, none of rank. The discipline was plain, severe, and democratic. Thus freedom, learning, and love made Rakow great.

Socinianism being too strong in Rakow for direct attack, the Jesuits had recourse to cunning. Their power was great over the people, and they waited only an occasion for using it. The occasion came. Some pupils of the school wantonly threw stones at a crucifix, placed outside the town. They were expelled; but the circumstance afforded sufficient ground of accusation against the school itself. The opportunity was seized; and in the face of opposition, a decree was passed on the 1st of May, 1638, devoting the school at Rakow to destruction, and placing all its preachers and professors under the ban of infamy. Remonstrance against this crying injustice was vain. The judgment was executed. The aged Siennynski died, broken of heart, and soon after the possession of Rakow fell into Roman Catholic hands; the church was dedicated to the "*Triune God*"; the school was abandoned, and the seat of intelligence and culture became a miserable village. The outcasts from Rakow fled to Kissielin, but Kissielin was likewise doomed. At the Colloquy of Thorn, from which the Socinians alone were peremptorily excluded, their last hope was confounded. Then came the wars, Kossack, Russian, and Swedish successively, bringing devastation upon the southern provinces of Poland, and special destruction upon the Unitarian communities which flourished there. The Swedish war proved most fatal to Socinianism in Poland. Many of the Unitarians joined the Swedish cause, expecting at least some amelioration of their sufferings. In this conduct they only followed the example of other Protestants, but being Socinians, their crime was greater, and now, besides their heresy, they incurred the additional odium of treason to their country. On the expulsion of the Swedes, in 1657, the fate of Socinianism was decided.

The Romanists procured a decree from John Kasimir, forbidding the confession of Arianism on pain of death, and ordering the officials to be strict in its execution under penalty of losing their places. This decree touched none but Socinians. Calvinist and Lutheran, Jew and Mahometan, were tolerated in Poland; being of an inferior quality, they were probably not so well worth persecuting. Doubtless the Church had an eye to the lands and offices, as well as to the souls, of the noble heretics. It was confident of getting one or the other, converts or crowns. The edict, atrocious at the best, but more atrocious as the violation of good faith and of a regal oath, went forth. "To show our clemency," it reads, "we will that every man who cleaves to his error be allowed a three years' respite, to sell his property, that his goods and person may be inviolate." During this interval, however, the exercise of religion and all participation in political affairs were strictly forbidden. But even this "clemency" was vouchsafed in irony; for Kasimir had sworn, in his coronation oath, that none should be persecuted for religion. That the character of this "clemency" might display itself to better advantage, after suitable delay another edict was passed, limiting the respite to two years. This was a ruse for gaining converts to Romanism through sudden fright. The Socinians could offer no resistance to this dreadful decree. The other Protestant sects, who should have seen their own safety endangered by such proceedings, chose to indulge their sectarian malice, instead of making common cause against Rome. The Socinians were wholly deserted. In vain they protested, appealing to old enactments and solemnly ratified privileges. Their efforts were useless. They who refused to become Roman Catholics must be exiled. Under the terrible pressure, a small proportion abandoned their faith. The remainder, except a few who chose to remain, wandered abroad over Europe in companies, poor and homeless. One band of five hundred were assaulted on the borders of Hungary, upon the very line of safety, by the Imperial troops, and robbed of what little they had, with insult and violence. Destitute and forlorn they came to Transylvania. The fugitives went to Germany, Silesia, and Prussia. They joined the little congregations of their brethren in the Netherlands; but persecution

followed them wherever they went; hunted by authority from the chief cities, they had no centre of influence and strength; with no root in the popular faith, and no permanent cohesion among themselves, they withered away. In Transylvania and the Netherlands Unitarianism dragged on a precarious life; but from the year 1660 we hear nothing of it until its new birth in England.

Several times in the course of this brief sketch of the history of Unitarianism, we have hinted at differences of opinion which existed among its professors. A word more now upon this point. Unitarians as a sect were knit together by an exceedingly fine thread. Their chief ground of sympathy was the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, — a very general denial. They were also united by a common liberality of mind; some of them by similarity of social position and fortune. They were united as the outcasts from other communions. They clustered together as fugitives. But there was no *Unitarianism*. Socinianism, the culminating point of all the thinking in the Antitrinitarian direction, was the system of an individual mind, or of a cluster of minds under an individual influence. It did not grow spontaneously from the free intermingling and development of many thoughts, but it was authoritatively and persuasively enforced by discussion and personal address, — enforced even against some darling tenets and strong propensities of the Unitarians. Unitarianism would have worked itself out into a much more simple and rational shape, but for Socinus.

The system contained in the Rakovian Catechism was substantially the same with modern Unitarianism. In the details of doctrine there are discrepancies; but essentially we find the same principles and the same conclusions. The questions of Human Nature, the Bible, Reason and Revelation, Reason and the Bible, Inspiration and Miracles, the object and method of Christianity, and the relation of Jesus to mankind, are stated very much as we hear them stated among us now. The fundamental propositions or axioms which are brought to bear against the Trinity, axioms suggested by the case they were urged to meet, are the same that have been used so often since. The distinction between doctrines contrary to reason, and doctrines above reason, was insisted upon and applied at discretion. Indeed, in this application it

sometimes happened that the discretion was more conspicuous than the faithfulness to principle; or rather, perhaps, the principles of reason themselves were not very clearly defined. In the comparative estimate of the Old and New Testaments, and in the distinction between the essential and the unessential in Christianity, we are reminded also of our modern system. But this was Socinianism. Previous to the time of Faustus Socinus, and until a few years before his death, sharp discussions had taken place among the Unitarians upon vital points. At first there was nothing but confusion in their belief. They agreed only in a single article of disbelief. By and by, in 1574, appeared a Confession of Faith of Polish Unitarians in the form of a Catechism, prepared, as is most likely, by George Schomann. In this Catechism general dogmas were shadowed forth in vague language. The unity of God was asserted. The doctrine concerning Christ was expressed in the words of Scripture entirely, to the effect that he was the Mediator, promised to the fathers by the prophets, born of David's line, by God's will made to be Saviour, through whom man is to be reconciled to God and made partaker of immortal life. The Holy Spirit is the Power of God transmitted to mankind through the only begotten Son. In the idea of Justification was included the necessity of personal goodness, as well as the fact of absolution from sin and its penalties. Baptism, to be administered only to adults, was defined as the inward and outward purification of a man who repents; an acknowledgment that he is washed in the blood of Christ, and by the Holy Spirit purged from all sin. The Catechism adopted Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper, which in the main accorded with that of the later Socinians, and regarded the institution simply as a commemorative rite. Within such general terms as these, there was certainly room enough for various opinions. Under so broad a roof enemies might dwell without collision. But the household was far from peaceful. While the Unitarians were unanimous in rejecting the Trinity, they were by no means agreed upon their doctrine of Christ. Some were Arians, holding that Jesus was preëxistent, had a superhuman side to his nature, and, associated with the Father, created the world. This view was strenuously maintained by Farnovius,

among others, whence the Unitarians got the name of Farnovians. Gregory Pauli, George Schomann, and their party, denied the preëxistence of Christ; said that his being commenced with his birth from the Virgin; that he was essentially a man, but since his ascension into glory was to be worshipped. Others, men of influence, Francis Davidis and Simon Budnæus at their head, went farther still, contending that Christ was not to be worshipped. Budnæus, as we have already remarked, even denied the supernatural birth of Jesus; said that he was the son of Joseph and Mary; and he was not alone in his opinion. Davidis used strong language; declared that Christ was the son of Joseph; that his words were not the words of God, and were to be tried by the Mosaic law; that the New Covenant existed only till the destruction of Jerusalem, and after that event would have no place till Jesus should come again; that Christ was no more to be worshipped than Mary and other dead saints, since he no longer discharges the function of Mediator between God and us. Faustus Socinus labored hard to convert this "semi-Judaizer," and resided at his house nearly six months for that purpose. But his arguments failed to convince. And no wonder; for Socinus, holding the Scripture in a powerful solution of exegesis, would not accept the preëxistence of Christ, and confessed there was no Bible authority for paying him homage, but in the same breath laid it down as a right and a duty, and even refused the Christian name to such as would not worship Jesus. As an instance of critical perversity, it must be mentioned how Socinus, as if to make amends for his numerous sins against the sacred text, concluded to save himself by sinning once more, and so, in scrupulous deference to John iii. 13 and vi. 62, affirmed that Christ ascended into heaven shortly before the commencement of his public ministry. Think of a man walking easily through the tangled passages in the Epistle to the Colossians, to stumble at last on a plain highway like this! Such were some of the prevailing opinions concerning the Trinity and its kindred dogmas.

On the question of Baptism, likewise, there were differences. The earlier Unitarians were Anabaptists, or at least strong opponents of infant baptism. Some only disapproved of infant baptism; others thought it a dam-

nable heresy. Some regarded it as of vital moment that adults should be baptized; others, Socinus at the head of them, treated the whole matter very lightly, saying that it was of no consequence whether one was baptized or not. This party were very magnanimously tolerant of their opponents, as uninterested people are wont to be.

Niemojewski, who believed that the communicant partook spiritually of the body of Christ, was bitterly opposed to Socinus, who viewed the Lord's Supper as a commemorative rite merely, and ascribed to it no peculiar efficacy of any sort.

Many of the Unitarians were exceedingly radical in their notions of society and government. Thus the learned and pious Gregory Pauli advocated a community of goods, and thought that Christians should neither accept civil offices, nor bear arms; a doctrine which the Socinian laity were especially unwilling to accept. John Niemojewski resigned his post as judge of the district of Krakow, from conscientious scruples about taking or exacting oaths. Of Martin Czechovicius Mr. Wallace says, "His opinions respecting worldly authorities were moderate, and he only recommended the refusal of obedience to them when they commanded actions contrary to the word of God." Czechovicius likewise contended that a Christian should neither accept of worldly offices, nor make use of weapons, and in other respects appears to have been a thorough *non-resistant*. Peter Gonesius turned the whole thing into ridicule by wearing a wooden sword. Such practical misgivings indicate that the Christian conscience was alive. These men were not merely active in head, but in heart also. It is surprising, if we may credit Mr. Wallace and Christopher Sandius, how clear from moral delinquencies were the characters of these heretics. They were not faultless; one or two were slightly stained with personal vices; some of their chief teachers were not wholly free from intolerance; but their average of moral character was high, and among them were exhibited instances of extraordinary self-sacrifice. They seem for the most part to have been natural men, believing in goodness and humanity, loving the beauty of virtue, trusting to the efficacy with God and men of a pure, true life. They were learned men for the most part; in their number were the best scholars of the age. A few had genius. Many had talents, and the

finest education their time offered. They were sharp reasoners and bold; mighty in the Scriptures; acquainted also with philosophy, which they were too wise to fear, to distrust, or to abhor. Their thinking was free; the activity of their minds overbalanced the weight of authority, so that in any conflict between Scripture and Reason, though Reason professed submission, it was Scripture that submitted. They respected the Bible too much to believe that it could disagree with them. They were not prepared to set up their opinions against the Bible, nor yet were they prepared to set up the Bible against their opinions; so they compromised by making the text conform. Their canons of interpretation were framed very much to suit their occasions. But so were all canons of interpretation framed. Theirs had a general advantage of result, if not of principle, for their opinions were better worth conforming to; and if their view of the Scriptures was cloudy and disturbed, and their practical treatment of them most unjustifiable, still much was done by the Unitarians to destroy the slavish adoration of texts, and to promote a free, rational, plain way of dealing with the Sacred Word. Had their course been unimpeded, theology would doubtless have been advanced by this time far beyond its present limits.

But the question arises, why was their course so fatally impeded? How was it that such men, so learned and worthy, carried no more influence with them? The obvious reply to this question is, that they were a small and odious minority, exposed to the whole power of the prevailing or established religions. So long as they had fair play in Poland, they held their own, nay, they increased. But as soon as the Jesuits were admitted to the kingdom, persecution came, and they were scattered. Protestant and Romanist were against them in Europe; Protestant and Romanist were against them in England. The people, strongly sectarian, were bitterly prejudiced in their hostility. They had no peace in believing. They were deprived of opportunities for organizing and spreading themselves. The public sentiment forbade their forming separate communions. The expression of their opinions rendered them liable to such pains as could be visited upon them. All this was unfavorable to their growth as a body of Christians.

But this alone was hardly sufficient to account for the

powerlessness of the Socinian doctrine. Even with the mighty of the world arrayed against it, it would have flourished but for some defect in itself. There was that inherent in the system which prevented its taking root in the hearts of men. In the first place, its ethical character was not congenial to the minds of people educated in the popular faith. The other religions insisted upon a supernatural virtue. They wanted to bring God miraculously into man, to sink man in God. They desired to produce, not goodness, but holiness, sanctification, regeneration. The common people had been accustomed to having their religious sensibilities kindled and agitated by Popish ceremonies and Calvinistic terrors. They craved the excitement of an unnatural, overawing belief, which kept their nature pliable under the horrible omnipotence or the weeping compassion of God. Socinianism, on the contrary, dwelt more on the power of the human will; appealed to the moral faculties; separated man from God by too wide a gulf; addressed itself, not to the religious feeling, but to the conscience, and thus of necessity brought down our religion's noble aspirations, and absorbing faith, and profound self-annihilation, to the plain works of common duty. Few of the Socinians were deeply religious men. They communicated no original piety to mankind. They were not through and through penetrated with a sense of God's reality, and therefore their teaching failed to nourish the soul. This is no matter of marvel. There could be no original spiritual life, except as the Good Father gave it here and there to an individual, among men who were all engaged in working themselves free from a complex theological system. The other sects were no better off than the Socinians. They only ruled by right of possession, and by the power of established doctrines. But then it required a far mightier power, even a fresh inspiration of Divine Love, to dispossess them; and that new revelation came not through the Socinians.

Again, Socinianism demanded more intellectual culture than the people possessed. The Protestant needed to be a man of stronger mind and more practised thought than the Romanist. The Socinian needed to be a man of stronger mind and more practised thought than the Protestant, because he gave his reason more work to do.

The Protestant of the Protestants, he threw off more than the Church authority, and, with his increase of intellectual liberty, gained an increase of intellectual responsibility. The Romanist and the Lutheran leaned their reason against a creed. They had their fundamental tenets established. Their theory of God and man, and Christ and the Bible, was determinately fixed, beyond discussion. This state of things afforded amazing comfort to the slumbering mind. The Socinian had no creed ultimately defined; he had no doctrines of God and man, of Christ and the Bible, which were placed beyond the reach of criticism and doubt, or in any manner assumed as dogmatical. He was a seeker. He proved all things, but had not yet found what good thing he should hold fast. He was neither supernaturalist nor naturalist, neither bibliolater nor rationalist, neither Arian nor humanitarian. He believed that man was neither wholly good nor wholly evil, that he was neither master of his moral will nor yet predestinated by God. He had not quite made up his mind where the facts of religion were. His position was a very trying one. It demanded great boldness, ingenuity, and alacrity of thought. It was not such a position as one would voluntarily assume. Only the few, who were driven into it by the inevitable doubt which is rare in the mass of men, would choose to accept its dangers. Not many persons will swim a torrent when there is an old bridge, ever so old, and ever so rotten, a mile higher up the stream. Hence Unitarianism found its adherents among the educated, thoughtful, and refined, almost exclusively in Poland, and to a very considerable extent in England. The distinguished Socinian professors of England were not farther removed from the people by their Antitrinitarianism than by their genius. Milton's "Comus" was probably no more interesting to the millions than his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine"; and John Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity" doubtless found as many intelligent disciples among the multitude as his "Essay on the Human Understanding." As to Sir Isaac Newton, we need say nothing about him.

It is easy, then, to explain the failure of Unitarianism. But it is hard to say how much we regret that failure. With the Socinian system, as expounded in the Rakovian Catechism, we have little sympathy. We perceive its in-

completeness and inconsistency; we are sensible of the want of a corner-stone in its building. But with Socinianism as a movement tending towards a more scientific treatment of religion and a more philosophical handling of theology, we have very great sympathy. Had the schools at Rakow and Altorf continued to flourish, we should have had by this time a better doctrine of human nature, a better doctrine consequently of the Divine nature, and then a nobler theory of Christianity, and the character of its founder,—a theory based upon facts, and not upon hypothesis.

Had Socinianism only given us a truer version of the Bible, or been present when our English translation was made, it would have done immense service. Notwithstanding the severe critical labors of the Polish brethren, their copious commentaries and ponderous editions of the Scriptures, the dullest eye can see that we have got, so to speak, a Trinitarian Bible. We by no means think that the whole Bible is susceptible of a Socinian or humanitarian interpretation, any more than that the whole Bible is susceptible of an Arian interpretation. But the good doctors who prepared King James's version discovered Trinitarianism everywhere, and even pressed into their service passages which, to say the least, were innocent of any such meaning. We will give one or two examples for illustration. Acts xx. 28, "The Church *of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood." According to the present established reading, it should be "the Church of the Lord," that is, of Christ. The pointing of Romans ix. 5, "Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever," indicates the Trinitarian bias. Quite as arbitrary is the rendering of 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Great is the mystery of *godliness*"; as if the writer was speaking of the *Godhead*, or the *Divine nature*, instead of referring to the new manifestation of *piety* in Christ. Again, in the supplying of words by Italics, the most unwarrantable liberties have been taken. Thus, 1 John iii. 16, the words "of God" are not in the original, but were invented for the translators' purpose. "The Lord of glory," 1 Cor. ii. 8, does not give exactly the idea of the Greek. "Glorious Lord" is more correct, and much less exalted. There are a great many passages in which Christ is improperly made in our version the object of worship. Matt. viii. 2, "There

came a leper and *worshipped* him"; Matt. xiv. 33, "They that were in the ship came and *worshipped* him"; and elsewhere. The word translated "worshipped" means simply "bowed down before him," that is, in obeisance and profound respect. But we cannot enlarge upon this point. It would lead us too far. If any are curious enough to follow out the hint, we refer them to Wilson's "Illustrations of Unitarianism," where the matter is very sufficiently handled.

Trinitarianism has appropriated to itself almost every mode of religious expression. We have Trinitarian prayers and hymns. Many of the noblest sacred songs in the language are so disfigured by it, that the power and beauty of their devotional sentiment are nearly destroyed. Some of the most magnificent music of the Church is made useless, except to the Trinitarian believer, or to him who can forget his belief. Well, the advance of thought cannot be retarded for ever. If you dam up a moving stream, the waters will cause devastation by their overflow, or will burst through the barrier with a more impetuous current. Sooner or later, we must have a rational religion and a scientific theology; a religion grounded upon the moral and spiritual constitution of man, and a theology conformed to the principles and facts of human reason.

O. B. F.

ART. IV.—SOUTHEY'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF ROBERT SOUTHEY.*

THIS work does not rise to the rank of a complete and well-digested biography. It comprises, indeed, a large amount of information respecting Southey's private life and daily habits; but this information is of the nature of raw material, and requires long and patient labor to bring it into an available form. Much of it, too, is exceedingly

* *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey.* Edited by his Son, the REV. CHARLES CUTHBERT SOUTHEY, M. A., Curate of Plumbland, Cumberland. In six volumes. London: Printed for Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1849-50. Post 8vo. pp. xii. and 352, 360, 352, 390, 368, 408.

dry and profitless; and the whole work has a disagreeable appearance of book-making. Nor does the reader feel much confidence that he has Southey's real opinions on many subjects, even after going through his voluminous correspondence as now edited by his son. There are frequent blanks and omissions, particularly in the letters on political subjects, which are sufficiently significant to those who are acquainted with the changes in Southey's views during the course of his long life; and on many points the narrative is meagre and imperfect. Of the various letters here given, the most important and valuable are the autobiographical letters written to Mr. John May, between 1820 and 1825, occupying, indeed, only about half of the first volume, but curious and instructive from the pictures of his childhood and youth which they present. As a letter-writer, Southey can hardly be placed in the first rank. His earlier letters are such as any young man of ordinary parts might have written; but as he grew older and his mind matured, they become more worthy of attention, and many of them possess great merit. Yet their general character may best be described in his own language in a letter to one of his most constant correspondents. "My letters," he writes, "like Gibbon's sentences, all go to one tune, and would furnish as pretty specimens of egotism as the memoirs of P. P." * This is perfectly true; and if the present editor had omitted a large part of the letters which he has published, and given us more of his own recollections of his father, more information in regard to the change in his father's opinions, more detail respecting his father's friends and contemporaries, his labors would have been entitled to a more respectful consideration. But as it is, the life of Robert Southey still remains to be written. It is, however, to this work that all future biographers must resort for a considerable portion of their materials.

In reviewing the life of Southey, the principal difficulty arises from its lack of moral unity. During his progress from youth to manhood, his opinions on nearly every political and religious question underwent a thorough and radical change; and it seems almost impossible to discover any general principle running through his life

* Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. I. p. 521.
VOL. L. — 4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. II.

around which his different and antagonistic views can be grouped so as to show their mutual relation and dependence. In Southey's case it is in vain to look for any clearly defined system of opinions resting on well-established logical convictions. Hence the ordinary arguments by which inconsistency may be explained, and even justified, do not meet the difficulty. It is not enough to say, that no man retains precisely the same opinions through life, and that even so wise and excellent a man as Sir James Mackintosh did not always adhere to the doctrines promulgated in the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, and was at one time regarded as an apostate by his own friends. It is not to be desired that any man should at all times and under all circumstances uphold the same abstract opinions with the same unbending firmness. This is particularly true in regard to statesmen. The man who pledges himself to a particular line of policy, and ignores all considerations of expediency, is utterly unworthy to be intrusted with the management of public affairs. Accordingly, we find that Earl Grey, perhaps the most upright and consistent statesman that England produced during the last generation, died with opinions somewhat modified from those with which he set out in early life. But this argument is not broad enough to embrace so wide a departure from first principles as we witness in Southey.

Neither will it be sufficient to show that he lived in a period of unexampled disorder and change, when all old institutions and opinions seemed everywhere to be giving place to new systems and ideas. Yet, as Southey's mind was always subjective rather than objective, it cannot be doubted that great weight should be attached to this argument. But even this does not fully meet the requirements of the case. So far as we now know, not one of Southey's contemporaries who was not also a poet went through so thorough a recantation. Not one of them changed his religious belief when he left the popular party and ranged himself on the side of prerogative. And though it is doubtless true, as Lord Brougham remarks, that "it would, indeed, be difficult to select one leading principle or prevailing sentiment in Mr. Burke's latest writings, to which something extremely adverse may not be found in his former, we can hardly say his early,

works, — excepting only on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, to which, with all the friends of Lord Rockingham, he was from the beginning adverse";* yet even he changed less than Southey. It is true that he quarrelled with those friends by whose side he had stood all through the American war, broke all personal and party ties, tore away from all the associations of the past, and planted himself on the extremest Tory ground; but he had never cherished the seditious principles of Wat Tyler, and never went beyond the subserviency of The Vision of Judgment.

If, then, we can explain Southey's changes neither on the ground of natural growth as his mind ripened, nor by a reference to the disturbed period in which he lived, we must seek elsewhere for their explanation. We must look for it in his own mind, — in his peculiar intellectual constitution. Now, a careful analysis of his mental processes shows certain results which, we conceive, fully satisfy the inquiry. His opinions appear to have entered his mind through the imagination, and not through the logical faculties. They grew out of his prejudices, rather than from his convictions. In truth, he does not seem to have been fitted either by nature or education to follow out a close and sustained argument, to weigh conflicting testimony, or compare the results of actual experiment. He possessed considerable fancy and imagination, though not of the highest order; but of that noble inductive method which Lord Bacon taught, he had no knowledge. His arguments were all addressed *ad hominem*, as in his essays on Catholic Emancipation, — the very idea of which frightened him almost as much as it did George the Third, — and, in fact, wherever argument was required. He had read almost every thing in general literature; but he had thought little. Hence his dislike of political economy, of the very first principles of which he was profoundly ignorant, even while he attempted to write upon it, and also of the exact sciences, with most of which he was equally unacquainted. In short, Southey adopted whatever opinions he at any time cherished because they pleased his imagination, and not because he believed them from any sufficient reason. In a similar way we

* Statesmen of the Time of George the Third.

can explain the eccentricities of Burke's splendid but erratic career. The recent conversions to Romanism and Puseyism, both in this country and in England, are likewise illustrations of the same principle. They have mainly taken place in persons of a fervid imagination morbidly excited by some external cause, who, while in that unreasoning state, have been brought into contact with the arrogant pretensions which Rome holds out, or the hardly less arrogant pretensions of the Tractarian writers. Persons whose intellects have been sharpened and toughened by dialectical practice are not liable to give up their opinions from such causes; but the young and romantic, and those of quick and lively sensibilities, will always be vulnerable by whatever touches their imaginations.

As would naturally be inferred, Southey was intolerant towards all who differed with him in opinion, and was one of the most virulent of partisan writers. No man ever treated his opponents with greater unfairness, or exhibited a more unrelenting hostility towards those who adhered to the opinions which he had himself laid aside. Of Lord Jeffrey, in particular, he was accustomed to write and speak in the most bitter and objurgatory terms. To William Taylor, he wrote that Jeffrey was "a mere child upon that subject [taste]; I never met with a man whom it was so easy to checkmate."* In another letter, alluding to Lord Jeffrey's review of Mr. Taylor's translation of *Nathan the Wise*, he says, — "I knew the man wrote like a coxcomb; still there was a sort of gentlemanly decorum, from which he did not think himself exempted, and this he has broken through."† A reference to the article in question shows the absurdity of this;‡ and even Mr. Taylor himself was compelled to notice it. "I agree with Jeffrey," he says in his reply to Southey's letter, "in most things about 'Nathan,' and am well satisfied with his reviewal."§ At a subsequent period we are told, that "of Judge Jeffrey of the *Edinburgh Review* I must ever think and speak as of a bad politician, a worse moralist, and a critic, in matters of

* *Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich*, Vol. II. p. 102.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. II. p. 129.

‡ *Edinburgh Review*, for April, 1806.

§ *Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich*, Vol. II. p. 135.

taste, equally incompetent and unjust." * Speaking of Sydney Smith, he exclaims, — "It were better to be a fanatic than such a buffoon as this, for fanaticism implies some feeling, some sincerity, some heart of flesh and blood." † Mrs. Barbauld he mentions under a coarse and degrading *soubriquet*; ‡ and of the younger Pitt he rarely, if ever, speaks in respectful terms. § Those statesmen whose measures he disapproved were stigmatized as "most miserable ministers," || "men of tried and convicted incapacity," ¶ and as deficient even in "good intentions." ** These extracts are taken almost at random from his familiar correspondence with his friends; but they are sufficient for our present purpose. They show how Southey habitually regarded and spoke of those who maintained different views from his own on the moral, political, and literary questions of the day. Additional illustrations will occur as we proceed, both from his published writings and from his letters. In the present instance, however, we have purposely confined our citations to the latter; since, as a general rule, a man's true character is much more likely to be revealed in the daily business of life, or the frankness of friendly communication, than in productions designed for popular effect. Taking these facts and considerations along with us in the discussion, we propose now to lay before our readers a rapid sketch of Southey's life and opinions, with such incidental observations on his different works as our limits may allow.

Robert Southey was the second son of respectable parents in the middling walks of life, and was born at Bristol, on the 12th of August, 1774. At the age of three he was sent to school to make acquaintance with the mysteries of the alphabet, and to be kept out of harm's way; for he was too young to learn much except the merest rudiments of knowledge. He remained at this school until he was six, living for most of the time

* Letter to Sir Walter Scott, December 8, 1807.

† Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. II. p. 232.

‡ Letter to S. T. Coleridge, March 14, 1804.

§ Letters, *passim*.

|| Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. I. p. 467.

¶ Letter to Grosvenor C. Bedford, Esq., May 5, 1807; and Letters, *passim*.

** Letter to C. H. Townsend, February 16, 1817.

with his aunt, Miss Tyler, a maiden lady of scrupulous neatness, but with many whimsical and uncomfortable notions. "I had many indulgences," says Southey, "but more privations, and those of an injurious kind; want of playmates, want of exercise, never being allowed to do any thing in which by possibility I might dirt myself; late hours in company, that is to say, late hours for a child, which I reckon among the privations (having always had the healthiest propensity for going to bed betimes); late hours of rising, which were less painful, perhaps, but in other respects worse."* His aunt was particularly fond of dramatic entertainments, and took him to the theatre when he was only four years old. After that he was frequently her companion, even before he was old enough to understand what he saw. Under such a pernicious system of mismanagement, it need not surprise us, that his imagination should have become injuriously affected, and in after years have usurped the place of the reasoning powers.

When he was six years old he was first permitted to wear boy's clothes, and sent to a school kept by a man; but he had only been here a year when the master died. He was next sent to Corston, nine miles from Bristol, where he passed another year, "with little profit and with a good deal of suffering." At length, and fortunately for him, the head-master and his son quarrelled, and came to blows; upon which the child was removed to a fourth school, at Bristol, under a Welsh master. But he added scarce any thing to his knowledge here. When not in school, where his training seems to have been poorly conducted, he spent most of his time in reading miscellaneous works, writing plays, hearing and talking about the theatre, and in similar employments. In Latin, and the common English branches, he appears to have made tolerable progress. In dancing, however, he was a sorry pupil; and the fiddle-bow was as often applied to his head as to the strings when he was called out. When not kicking the master, which was not unfrequently practised, he went through the lesson with a dogged determination of never dancing again after he had once made his escape from the school. Forty years

* Autobiographical Letter, April 7, 1821.

afterwards he tells us he had piously kept the determination to that hour.*

After leaving this school, he was for a short time the pupil of a clergyman named Lewis, who taught him the rudiments of Greek, and accustomed him to compose in prose and verse; and under whom he improved rapidly. In 1788, he was taken up to London, for the first time, by his aunt, and entered the high school at Westminster. Here his time was pleasantly and profitably passed until the spring of 1792, when he was expelled on account of an act of culpable indiscretion on his part, which gives early evidence of his tendency to use strong and bitter language. Fired by the brilliant success of Canning and the Etonians in the *Microcosm*, Southey and some of his friends at Westminster essayed to imitate it in a periodical called *The Flagellant*. Four numbers only had been published, when he wrote and inserted a letter ridiculing and attacking the system of corporal punishment which formed a part of the discipline of the school. Dr. Vincent, the head-master, was at once aroused by this attack on his authority, and commenced a suit against the publisher of the paper. Nor did the storm blow over until Southey was compelled to leave the school.

News of this affair soon reached Oxford, and caused his rejection at Christ Church College; but he was at length entered of Baliol College, on the 21st of October, 1792. It is not easy to determine what was the exact state of his opinions when he went to Oxford. It does not, indeed, seem probable that a boy of eighteen, brought up as he had been, should have had any well defined or firmly established views. But as he had already been expelled from school in consequence of giving utterance to opinions deemed subversive of that just authority without which no school can be carried on, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he was beginning to entertain those loose and anarchical sentiments which he soon afterwards held, and which are found in most of the early productions of his pen. Within a month after he entered Oxford, he asks, in a letter to a friend,—“Is it not rather disgraceful, at the moment when Europe is on fire with

* Autobiographical Letter, May 27, 1824.

freedom, — when man and monarch are contending, — to sit and study Euclid or Hugo Grotius ? ” * A year after this he completed *Joan of Arc*, as first published, and a few months later wrote *Wat Tyler*. The difference between these two poems doubtless shows the progress of his opinions. His imagination had become excited by dwelling on the abstract rights of man, the natural sovereignty of the people, and the duty of resisting unjust government; and even the uncongenial atmosphere of Oxford could not cool his ardor. In truth, most of his time at college was spent in meditating on the patriots of Greece and Rome, devising new schemes of social reform, and writing seditious poetry, to the great neglect of those studies which he ought rather to have pursued. “The more I see of this strange world,” he writes, “the more I am convinced that society requires desperate remedies.” † At the same time, his mind was filled with sad forebodings for the future destiny of the race, as he pictured to himself what he considered was its actual condition. “I look round the world,” he exclaims, “and everywhere find the same mournful spectacle, — the strong tyrannizing over the weak, man and beast. The same depravity pervades the whole creation; oppression is triumphant everywhere, and the only difference is, that it acts in Turkey through the anger of a grand seignior, in France of a revolutionary tribunal, and in England of a prime minister. There is no place for virtue.” ‡ From this misanthropic state his mind was aroused by the bright vision of Pantisocracy, of which we shall presently speak in another connection.

But not only did Southey pass through a strange and sad experience in regard to his political opinions whilst at college. His religious opinions were in an equally unsettled state. It is certain that at one time he held opinions in some degree approximating to those cherished by the great body of Unitarians; but it is not less certain, that they rested on no sufficient basis, and were loosely held. Indeed, Southey was mentally incompetent to weigh the arguments on which a belief in those views of Scriptural truth that we maintain must rest.

* Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., November 20, 1792.

† Letter to Horace Bedford, Esq., December 22, 1793.

‡ Letter to Grosvenor C. Bedford, Esq., November 11, 1793.

As we have already shown, he was in the habit of looking at every thing through the imagination; and this was precisely the case in respect to his religious beliefs. He was temporarily struck with the simplicity and grandeur of our doctrines concerning God and Christ and man, without for a moment noticing how they accord with Scripture and reason; and he became a Unitarian. His faith rested on his imagination; and as his opinions became more and more subversive of all human government, he readily exchanged his *quasi* Unitarianism for views more in accordance with his political notions. He fell into atheistical ways of thinking, and approached the verge of actual unbelief. He had entered college with the intention of taking orders in the Church of England; but her doctrines were now so repugnant to him, that he speedily gave up this intention. And though he was in after years among the foremost to advocate her claims, he appears never to have fully given his assent to her tenets.

With the mental habits which he had brought with him to Oxford, and with his mind already so full of crude speculations, it is obvious that he would not profit much by the course of studies pursued at the English Universities, since it is addressed to an entirely different set of faculties from those which he had hitherto cultivated. "Of all the months in my life (happily they did not amount to years)," he writes to a college friend, "those which were passed at Oxford were the most unprofitable. What Greek I took there I literally left there, and could not help losing; and all I learned was a little swimming (very little the worse luck) and a little boating, which is greatly improved, now that I have a boat of my own upon this delightful lake."* He had hardly been at college three months when he wrote, — "Never shall child of mine enter a public school or a university."† This intention he partially carried out in the case of his two sons; but the eldest died before the experiment was fully tried, and the second was sent to college at the usual age, to prepare for the Church. It was doubtless the unsatisfactory result obtained in his own case, with a knowledge

* Letter to Rev. Nicholas Lightfoot, April 24, 1807.

† Letter to Grosvenor C. Bedford, Esq., March 16, 1793.

of the demoralizing influences which he had himself witnessed, that led him to try the effect of domestic education on the children whom he loved with such a depth of tenderness as is rarely seen. At college his mind vacillated between each of the three learned professions, as they are called; and to each he at one time or another devoted his chief attention. He, however, gained little positive benefit from his study of them, and experienced considerable mental exercise as they severally became distasteful to him.

Southey did not remain long at Oxford. In June, 1794, he first became acquainted with Samuel Taylor Coleridge; and this acquaintance was to change the whole tenor of his life. Coleridge was his senior by two years, and like him had adopted liberal principles both in politics and religion, though he had not gone quite as far in the latter as Southey. They soon formed a close friendship, founded on mutual admiration; and before long Coleridge proceeded to unfold his scheme of Pantisocracy to his new friend and admirer. Southey's mind was ripe for the plan, as he had already conceived the idea of emigrating to America; and his enthusiasm was at once kindled to the height. "The thoughts of the day and the visions of the night," he writes to his brother, "all centre in America."* And a month later he adds, — "This Pantisocratic scheme has given me new life, new hope, new energy; all the faculties of my mind are dilated; I am weeding out the few lurking prejudices of habit, and looking forward to happiness. I wish I could transfuse some of my high hope and enthusiasm into you; it would warm you in the cold winter nights."† Every thing was progressing finely, when his aunt heard of the scheme, and of Southey's intended marriage; and neither piece of information was at all calculated to conciliate her good-will. Her anger was fiercely excited, and she declared she would never see him again, nor open any letter which he might send her; and ended by turning him out of doors, penniless and on a wet night. This did not dishearten him; and it was only when it became evident that sufficient money could not be obtained to

* Letter to Thomas Southey, Esq., September 20, 1794.

† Letter to the same, October 14, 1794.

transport the party to this country, that the execution of the plan was postponed. It had been their original design, to form an association of married men of studious habits and moderate means, who were to unite in the purchase of a tract of land to be owned in common, and cultivated by their joint labor, while they should occupy separate dwellings, and employ their leisure in social conversation and literary pursuits. Finding it impossible to carry out this purpose in its original grandeur amidst the wilds of Pennsylvania, as was at one time proposed, Southey suggested the expediency of trying it upon a smaller scale in Wales; but his suggestion was deemed impracticable, and the whole scheme was soon after given up.

The want of money now began to weigh heavily on Southey; and early in 1795 he commenced a course of historical lectures at Bristol, in order to raise a supply for his current expenses. Of these lectures no traces remain among his papers; but they appear to have been well attended, and to have added something to his pecuniary resources. About the same time he sold his first volume of poems for thirty guineas to Mr. Cottle, a Bristol bookseller, who proved a kind and generous friend to him, and who soon after purchased *Joan of Arc* for fifty guineas. Still Southey's means were scanty indeed, and he was wholly dependent on Mr. Cottle for his daily subsistence. "Your house," he says in a letter to Mr. Cottle, "was my house when I had no other. The very money with which I bought my wedding ring, and paid my marriage fees, was supplied by you. It was with your sisters that I left my Edith, during my six months' absence; and for the six months after my return, it was from you that I received, week by week, the little on which we lived, till I was enabled to live by other means."* It was under these circumstances that Southey was privately married to Miss Edith Fricker, a sister of Coleridge's wife, on the 14th of November, 1795, when he had but just entered on his twenty-second year. This marriage, however, which was thus clouded at its commencement, was eminently a happy one for both parties; and in all the domestic relations Southey was irreproachable, while his

* Cottle's *Reminiscences of S. T. Coleridge and R. Southey*, pp. ix., x.

wife proved worthy of such a husband. Soon after his marriage he writes, — "Surely a man does not do his duty who leaves his wife to evenings of solitude, and I feel duty and happiness to be inseparable. I am happier at home than any other society can possibly make me." * On this subject his views appear never to have changed through life. Twenty years later, his own experience of matrimony had been so pleasant as to induce him to congratulate a friend, who was on the eve of marrying, in most emphatic language. "I am glad," he says, "to hear that you have taken your chance for happiness in that state in which alone there is a chance of finding it." †

Southey's friends had been much opposed to his engagement with Miss Fricker, and had endeavoured to break off what they regarded as an unwise attachment. Accordingly, his uncle, the Rev. Herbert Hill, invited him to reside with him at Lisbon for a time, in order that absence might weaken his affection, and that a healthy influence might change his political and religious views. The first purpose, as we have seen, signally failed; and Southey took leave of his wife at the church door when he started from Bristol to accompany his uncle on their foreign journey. He only remained abroad six months; and gladly returned to England, in the spring of 1796. But during this time he had gained some knowledge of Portuguese and Spanish literature, which afterwards proved of great service to him, and laid the foundation for his very thorough acquaintance with the languages and literatures of those nations. His uncle's opinion of him is curious and striking. In a letter to a friend, after enumerating the young man's good qualities, he adds, — "In short, he has every thing you would wish a young man to have, excepting common sense or prudence." ‡ This opinion had much of truth in it, and shows how clearly his uncle perceived Southey's want of practical talent.

Upon his return to England, Southey took up his abode at Bristol, and passed most of his time in preparing a volume of Letters from Spain and Portugal for the

* Letter to Joseph Cottle, February, 1797.

† Letter to John Taylor Coleridge, Esq., September 8, 1818.

‡ *Life and Correspondence*, Vol. I. p. 274.

press, and in writing for the *Monthly Magazine*. His mind was now fixed on the law as a profession; but no man was ever less fitted for legal studies, and we are not at all surprised that it should seem to him nothing better than "a horrid jargon,—a quibbling collection of voluminous nonsense."*. He, however, went up to London early in 1797, and entered himself of Gray's Inn; but he kept his terms with little regularity, and was continually threatening to burn his law books. Finally, after his return from his second residence in Portugal, little more is said of the law; and even before he went abroad the second time, he appears to have given up all thought of rising to distinction in that way, or even of obtaining a livelihood by it. Henceforth literature was to be his sole profession, and, resigning all idea of becoming a clergyman, a physician, or a lawyer, he determined to be "a writer of books," a phrase by which Mr. Carlyle once described himself. To this business he devoted himself with a zeal and perseverance which have never been surpassed, and rarely equalled. His son gives a list of his writings, embracing forty-five publications in book form, besides about a hundred articles in the *Quarterly Review*, and numberless papers and essays in other periodicals, of which no record remains.

Early in the spring of 1800, he made his second visit to the Peninsula, partly for the sake of his health, and partly for the purpose of obtaining materials for a proposed *History of Portugal*. He was accompanied by his wife, and remained abroad until June, 1801, residing chiefly at Cintra, a pleasant little place not far from Lisbon, and occasionally travelling through the country. Here he was contented and happy; but the city itself did not please him, and its filthy condition doubtless strengthened his deep and habitual dislike of an urban residence. "Lisbon," he writes to his brother, "has twice been clean since the creation. Noah's flood washed it once, and the fire after the earthquake purified it. When it will be clean again will be difficult to say; probably not till the general conflagration."† It, however, afforded him the means of acquiring a knowledge of the history of Portu-

* Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., November 21, 1796.

† Letter to Lieutenant Southey, May 23, 1800.

guese literature; and his time was fully occupied in his literary labors. Whilst in Portugal, he published the first edition of *Thalaba*, a long and irregular poem founded on the peculiarities of the Mahometan faith, and somewhat defective both in the plan and execution, but containing passages of great and manifest beauty. Long before this he had formed the plan of *Madoc*, and made some progress in its composition; and it was now resumed, and continued at intervals, when no other work interfered with its progress.

Southey returned to England entirely recovered in health, but somewhat reluctant to leave the soft climate of the South for "the rains, and the fogs, and the frosts" of his native land; and finally took a lease of Greta Hall, Keswick, a few miles only from Wordsworth's house, where he continued to reside until his death. Soon after his return, and before his removal to Keswick, he was offered the appointment of private secretary to Mr. Corry, Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland, with a salary of about seventeen hundred dollars. He accepted the appointment, and proceeded immediately to Dublin; but he soon became dissatisfied with it, threw up the office, and returned home in disgust. About the same time he lost his mother, to whom he was tenderly attached; and the shock which her death occasioned doubtless conspired to render his official position still more disagreeable, and make him long for the comforts of a settled residence. Whilst he was still undecided on this point, he entered into a negotiation for a house in South Wales; but the arrangement was never completed, and at the earnest solicitation of Mr. Coleridge, who then resided there, he removed to Keswick in the beginning of September, 1803. Here he had abundant time to devote to his literary pursuits, and to plan new works, many of which were never to be executed. Besides the works of which mention has already been made, he had published an abridgment of *Amadis of Gaul*, a new edition of Chatterton's Works, and two volumes of the *Annual Anthology*; and he was now meditating the *History of Portugal*, a gigantic *Bibliotheca Britannica*, and *Madoc*. Of these plans *Madoc* alone was completed. The *Bibliotheca* was given up in consequence of its size, and he did not live to finish the *Portuguese History*, though it occupied his thoughts as

long as his mind retained any of its original powers. Southey was always much given to planning publications which were never executed, and the number of such abortive schemes mentioned in his letters is very large. Yet, as we have already intimated, he was one of the most industrious and punctual of men; and few authors have left behind them such an amount of printed matter, to say nothing of his manuscripts and letters.

In 1805, he published *Madoc*, which had been in preparation for more than fifteen years, and prefaced it with the following characteristic lines:—

“Come, listen to a tale of times of old!
Come, for ye know me. I am he who sang
The Maid of Arc, and I am he who framed
Of Thalaba the wild and wondrous song.
Come, listen to my lay, and ye shall hear
How Madoc from the shores of Britain spread
The adventurous sail, explored the ocean paths,
And quelled barbarian power, and overthrew
The bloody altars of Idolatry,
And planted in its fanes triumphantly
The cross of Christ. Come, listen to my lay!”

But the public were not disposed to heed this gentle invitation; for though in several letters written about the time of its publication he speaks of its being greatly admired and selling rapidly, he afterwards writes to Mr. Taylor, — “My profits upon this poem in the course of twelve months amount precisely to three pounds, seventeen shillings, and one penny. In the same space of time Walter Scott has sold 4,500 copies of his ‘Lay,’ and netted, of course, above a thousand pounds.”* The unfavorable opinion which these facts imply has been confirmed by a subsequent generation; and the poem is now but little read, and has few admirers even among those who entertain the highest opinion in regard to Southey’s genius. Southey himself, however, had a very different notion of its merit, and was well satisfied that it was the best poem which had been published since *Paradise Lost*.† In the same year he published his *Metrical Tales* and other Poems, comprising the best of his minor pieces. It was in these shorter poems, we conceive, that his poetical powers are exhibited to the best advantage; and it is by them and by extracts from his more elaborate productions,

* Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. II. p. 124.

† Letter to Lieutenant Southey, December 7, 1805.

we believe, that he is most likely to be remembered as a poet.

His opinions were now beginning to change from what they had been whilst he was at college, and to assume the character which they bore during his middle life. But they were still somewhat unsettled, and when the Fox and Grenville administration came in, in 1806, we find him writing, — "I was ministerial under Addington, regarded his successor [Pitt] with the utmost indignation, and am exceedingly well pleased at the present changes. Time, you say, moderates opinions as it mellows wine. My views and hopes are certainly altered, though the heart and soul of my wishes continue the same. It is the world that has changed, not I."* In another letter, the reference to which we have accidentally mislaid, he tells us that his later opinions were "developed" from those which he held in early life. If we except the development theory of the writer of *The Vestiges of Creation*, nothing is so absurd as this idea with which Southey flattered himself. There is no natural or logical connection between the views which he held at any one time and those which he held at another time. But while his mind was thus busy with politics, it was not idle on other subjects. At this time he was engaged on the *History of Portugal*, *The Chronicle of the Cid*, *The Curse of Kehama*, and *Espriella's Letters*; and, besides devoting much time to these, he made several short journeys during the year, to Edinburgh, London, and other parts of the country.

Notwithstanding Southey's intolerance of those who differed with him in opinion, he manifested great kindness in all the relations of private life; and few persons have ever shown greater inclination to aid young men of talent who were struggling against adverse fortune. In 1804, he had become interested in the poems of Henry Kirke White; and upon the death of that amiable and unfortunate young man, he readily entered into an arrangement to edit his works and prepare a sketch of his life. This was to him a labor of love, though he had little or no sympathy with White's religious opinions; and from it arose a close friendship with the young poet's two brothers, to whom many of the letters in the present

* Letter to the Rev. Nicholas Lightfoot, February 8, 1806.

volumes are addressed. The work was received with great favor, and, like all his biographies, was admirably arranged, and written with great eloquence and beauty. In subsequent years we find him helping many other young poets of promise; but for none does he seem to have entertained the same regard as for young White. It is a somewhat curious coincidence, that when he was in Bristol for a short time, not many months after he had prepared his edition of Kirke White's *Literary Remains*, he should have met with Mr. Walter Savage Landor, the man he "was most desirous of meeting," and that the encouragement which he received from that gentleman should have led him to take up poetry again when he had almost determined to forego its composition.*

In the spring of 1809, the *Quarterly Review* was set up by the Tories, to counteract the powerful influence of the *Edinburgh Review*; and Southey, who had refused to contribute to the latter on account of his dislike of its politics, immediately became one of the principal contributors to the new journal. But it is well known that Mr. Gifford, its conductor, exercised his right of editorial supervision with unwarrantable severity; and many years after its commencement Southey complains that not one of his articles was published without mutilation. We have taken the pains to look through nearly all of the articles contributed by him at different times; and it is our deliberate judgment, that a higher idea of his powers may be obtained from them than from any of his prose works, except his biographies. They cannot, indeed, be compared with the matchless essays of Lord Jeffrey and Mr. Macaulay; but with the exception of those papers which are designed to be argumentative, or which are levelled against his opponents, they possess great merit. They embrace a wide range of subjects, but are mostly biographical and historical, or reviews of books of travel; and are written in that clear and graceful style which always makes his prose so delightful. They all show that wonderful extent of reading which he had somehow managed to go over; and we believe there are not more than ten or twelve from which some curious fact of general interest or value may not be

* Letters, *passim*.

drawn. In bestowing this praise, it is necessary to exclude the political and controversial articles. They are marked by the fiercest intolerance, and are utterly worthless as arguments in favor of the cause which they uphold. Nor was this cause one in the success of which any friend of free institutions could rejoice.

In August of the same year he undertook the historical part of the *Edinburgh Annual Register*, with an annual salary of £ 400. In this work he expressed his opinions with so much virulence, that the *Edinburgh Reviewers*, who were not at all reluctant to attack him, recommended it for government prosecution; and at one time it was probable that this recommendation would be acted upon. The work, however, proved to be so unprofitable a speculation for its proprietors, and there was so much irregularity in the payment of his salary, that he withdrew from it at the end of three years, — much to his pecuniary disadvantage; for during his connection with it he seems to have been more profitably employed than at any other time in his life. The *Quarterly Review*, too, paid him liberally for his contributions; and from these and other sources he was in receipt of a very considerable income, though by no means so large as was believed by many of his contemporaries. In the midst of these various occupations, he still found time for poetry; and before one poem was fairly through the press, another was commenced. In fact, he seldom had fewer than three or four works in progress at the same time. "I am one of those lucky people," he says in one of his letters, "who find their business their amusement, and contrive to do more by having half a dozen things in hand at once, than if employed upon any single one of them."* With this view, he divided the working hours of each day between the several books which he was then writing; and so habituated himself to this division of time, that he could pass from history to poetry or criticism without the slightest difficulty. He thus kept all his time constantly occupied, and accomplished an amount of mental labor which it would have been impossible for him to perform in any other way.

His next publication was the first volume of the *His-*

* Letter to John Rickman, Esq., January 21, 1810.

tory of Brazil, a ponderous work in three quarto volumes, which has long been forgotten, but of which he himself had an immoderately high opinion. In one of his letters, after expatiating on the character of the work, he remarks,—"I should deal insincerely with you if I did not add, that ages hence it will be found among those works which are not destined to perish, and secure for me a remembrance in other countries as well as in my own; that it will be read in the heart of South America, and communicate to the Brazilians, when they shall have become a powerful nation, much of their own history which would otherwise have perished, and be to them what the work of Herodotus is to Europe."* Such was Southey's opinion, as expressed in a letter which his son has published; but whether his son entertains the same opinion does not appear. About the same time he published *The Curse of Kehama*, the wildest and most extravagant of all his poems, in which he endeavoured to weave the charm of poetry around the Hindoo mythology, but with very doubtful success. Nor does it seem probable that the poem will ever obtain a more favorable reception than it met with on its first appearance. His next publication, however, was more successful. This was the *Life of Nelson*, which is almost universally regarded as the best of his prose works, and will undoubtedly be read as long as the name of its hero shall be held in honor by Englishmen. Indeed, we know of no other biography which has had so many readers and admirers among all classes.

Upon the death of Mr. Pye, in the summer of 1813, he was offered the appointment of poet laureate, which after some delay he accepted. But he did nothing to elevate the character of an office which had already sunk below contempt; and the Edinburgh Reviewers were justified by the facts when they declared that "his Laureate Odes are utterly and intolerably bad, and, if he had never written any thing else, must have ranked him below Colley Cibber in genius, and above him in conceit and presumption."† The first on the list of these abject productions was the *Carmen Triumphale*, which the same witty

* Letter to C. H. Townsend, Esq., July 20, 1819.

† Edinburgh Review, for January, 1816.

essayists happily described as "a strange farrago of bad psalmody and stupid newspapers." * Even this, however, was better than some of his later poems; and fortunately for his reputation, the same year witnessed the publication of *Roderick*, in every respect the best of his poems, and a work of no common merit and beauty. Of this he was himself conscious. "You have in *Roderick*," he writes, "the best which I have done, and probably the best that I shall do, which is rather a melancholy feeling for the author." †

After the battle of Waterloo had put an end to the war which had been waged so long and at so great a cost to England, Southey fell in with the common current of his countrymen, and went over to the Continent. On his return, he published *The Poet's Pilgrimage to Waterloo*, — a work of no great merit, for while the first part contains several beautiful passages, the whole is little better than a mere party pamphlet. The temper of mind in which it was composed will best be shown by an extract from a letter written immediately after his return. Alluding to the feelings abroad in relation to Bonaparte, he says he found "a very proper degree of disappointment and indignation that he had not been put to death as he deserved, — a feeling in which I heartily concurred." ‡ But domestic sorrow soon checked the utterance of these amiable wishes. On the 17th of April, 1816, he lost his only son, Herbert, a fine boy of ten, on whom he had lavished his choicest affections; and for a time he could hardly bear up under the bereavement. His letters are full of mournful allusions to his loss. "My spirits," he writes, "do not recover: that they should again be what they have been, I do not expect; that, indeed, is impossible." § From this state of despondency he roused himself sufficiently to complete *The Lay of the Laureate*, a nuptial poem written on occasion of the marriage of the Princess Charlotte. In one of his letters he tells us that this poem had not derived "the slightest cast of coloring" from his existing state of mind; || but

* *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1814.

† Letter to Dr. Gooch, November 30, 1814.

‡ Letter to Sir Walter Scott, March 17, 1816.

§ Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., May 15, 1816.

|| Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., April 30, 1816.

the evidence on the face of the poem itself is so strong, that we can hardly believe it was not insensibly colored by his own experience.

His opinions on political and religious questions had now hardened into ultra Toryism and High Churchism; and though this remarkable change had excited the fiercest animosity of the friends of liberal principles in government, it had been hailed with delight by the disciples and followers of Mr. Perceval and Lord Eldon. In consequence of the satisfaction with which they regarded it, Lord Liverpool, in the following summer, intimated a wish that he would go up to London and confer with the ministry. Their object appears to have been, to set up a journal of which Southey should be editor, and which should be devoted to the support of their administration. After a little hesitancy he declined to assume the charge of any paper; but expressed a willingness to write a book on the state of the nation. The work, however, was never published, though a considerable amount of materials was collected. Soon after this he was a good deal annoyed by the surreptitious publication of *Wat Tyler*, and by an attack made upon him on the floor of Parliament by William Smith, Esq., of Norwich, who declared that the poem "appeared to him to be the most seditious book that was ever written." Lord Brougham had previously alluded to it, and called the attention of the Attorney-General to the principles contained in it; but Mr. Smith did not confine his remarks to the book in question. He made a more direct attack on Southey, contrasted the sentiments in *Wat Tyler* with the sentiments contained in his later works, and commented with great severity on his tergiversations. This attack called forth a fierce and bitter reply, in a Letter to William Smith, Esq., M. P., in which Southey defended the book, and explained his views at considerable length, concluding in a strain of ridiculous and contemptible egotism, by predicting that his own name and works would be immortal, while his opponent would only be remembered as "a certain Mr. William Smith."* He also applied to the Court of Chancery for an injunction upon the publication and sale of the book; but Lord

* Vol. IV., Appendix.

Eldon refused it, on the ground that the work was a seditious publication, and therefore the author could have no title in it.

About the same time he received a proposition to write the leading editorials in the *London Times*, which he promptly declined; and soon after made another short excursion to the Continent by way of relaxation from his labors. His next important publication was *The Life of Wesley*, an elegant and graceful biography, but written from a High Church point of view. This was followed, in 1821, by *A Vision of Judgment*, a wretched apotheosis of George the Third in hexameters, which even the present editor finds it difficult to defend against the charge of blasphemy. Few persons, indeed, except George the Fourth, to whom it was dedicated, have been found who could either read or admire it; but that monarch sent word to Southey, that he had read it twice, "and was well pleased with it."* In the preface to it, Southey had taken occasion to assail the writings of Lord Byron and his imitators, describing them as the Satanic school in literature, and indulging in many other opprobrious epithets. To this attack Lord Byron replied with biting sarcasm, in an angry and contemptuous parody likewise called *The Vision of Judgment*; and a fierce quarrel arose between them, which was only terminated with death. Southey next published the first volume of an elaborate and tedious *History of the Peninsular War*, which had ceased to be read even before the appearance of Colonel Napier's fascinating volumes, and has now completely vanished from sight. Close upon this came the *Book of the Church*, which, standing by the side of *A Vision of Judgment*, indicates the extreme point his opinions had now reached. It contains, amidst much trash, considerable curious and interesting matter which is worth separating from the bigoted and puerile arguments that overlay it. It was attacked by Charles Butler, the most eminent Roman Catholic writer then living in England, and defended by Southey in a second publication, entitled *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

In the spring of 1825, he went to Holland, and was for some time the guest of Mr. Bilderdijk, at Leyden,

* Letter to Rev. Nicholas Lightfoot, June 2, 1821.

whose wife had translated Roderick into Dutch. In 1826, during a second visit to the same kind friends, he was chosen member of Parliament from Downton, a nomination borough in the gift of Lord Radnor; but he wisely declined the proffered honor. He himself well knew that he was totally unfitted both by nature and education to appear to advantage amid the turmoil of party strife. "You are right," he says, "in supposing that I should have made a bad statesman, and you may add to it that for no one line of life should I have been well qualified except for the clerical profession."* Nevertheless, in 1829, he determined to enter the lists of partisan warfare, and published his *Colloquies on Society*, which were mercilessly ridiculed and controverted by Mr. Macaulay, in one of the ablest articles ever written by him. During the progress of the Reform Bill, he appears to have been greatly exercised in mind; for he had long entertained a notion that "Parliamentary Reform is the shortest road to anarchy."† His letters at this time are full of dire prophecies and lamentations over the weakness and wickedness of Earl Grey's ministry; and there was doubtless a feeling of triumph when he wrote, a few months after the bill had passed,—"It is already apparent that the reformed Parliament will not work."‡

The Whig ministry, however, notwithstanding their dislike of his politics, had treated him with great consideration; and soon after Lord Brougham took office, Southey received a polite letter from him inviting him to give his views in relation to the best means by which government could encourage literary and scientific pursuits. To this letter Southey replied with cold civility; and as the Chancellor became more and more engaged in his law reforms, the matter appears to have been entirely forgotten. In the mean time Southey had completed the *History of the Peninsular War*, and published two small volumes of poetry, besides preparing the *Lives of Uneducated Poets*, prefixed to a volume of poems by an old household servant in whom he was much interested, the *Select British Poets*, and a new edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, with a life of Bunyan. Though he had

* Letter to Henry Taylor, Esq., November 13, 1826.

† Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., February 16, 1811.

‡ Letter to John May, Esq., March 1, 1833.

no cause to complain of any lack of civility on the part of the Grey and Melbourne administrations, it was not until the Tories again came into power that the sunshine of court favor began to fall on him once more. On the 1st of April, 1835, Sir Robert Peel wrote to him, offering him a baronetcy, and intimating a wish to serve him in any way that would be most agreeable to him. Southey, in his reply, entered into a detailed statement of his pecuniary affairs, and declined the offer, on the ground that it would be oppressive to his family to maintain the dignity of the station in the event of his sudden death. Sir Robert then determined to add £ 300 a year to the pension which had been given him by the Grenville ministry; and this intention was fully carried into effect before Lord Melbourne returned to office.

Southey was much pleased with this generous recognition of his claims on the part of his political friends; and there are frequent allusions to it in his letters. But a deep grief was then preying on his mind and casting a sober hue over all his joys. His wife, who had shared all his joys and sorrows through forty years, and to whom he was devotedly attached, had become hopelessly insane, and been carried to a lunatic asylum. Finding that her case was incurable, he afterwards brought her home; and during the remainder of her life he watched over her with unremitting care. From this "pitiable state of existence" she was released by death on the 16th of November, 1837. Southey had loved her with the utmost intensity of affection, and his grief at her loss was deep and sincere. "During more than two thirds of my life," he writes, "she had been the chief object of my thoughts, and I of hers. No man ever had a truer helpmate! no children a more careful mother. No family was ever more wisely ordered, no housekeeping ever conducted with greater prudence or greater comfort."* Time, however, soon assuaged his grief; and on the 5th of June, 1839, when sixty-five years old, he was married to Miss Caroline Bowles, a sister of the editor of Pope's works, and herself a poet of considerable merit, and the author of several volumes.

His last publications were a *Naval History of England*,

* Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., November 24, 1837.

in Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia, which he did not live to complete; *The Doctor*, one of the most curious and remarkable books ever published; a new edition of Cowper's Works, with a Life; and a collected edition of his own Poems. His powers, however, were now on their wane; and before long his mind was completely shattered. He had endured an amount of mental labor to which few men in any age have been equal; and at last both body and mind gave way. They could bear the strain no longer; and during the last years of his life he sank into a state of complete mental imbecility. But even now, according to his son, "His mind, while any spark of its reasoning powers remained, was busy with its old day-dreams,—the History of Portugal, the History of the Monastic Orders, the Doctor; all were soon to be taken in hand in earnest, all completed, and new works added to these."* He would sit and read, or walk mechanically round his library and take down the volumes which he had formerly loved, while his vacant look and hesitating step showed that reason had forsaken her throne. Death was, indeed, a blessing to him. He died on the 21st of March, 1843, and was buried in Crowthwaite churchyard, within sight of the once happy home where he had passed so many busy years. A monument was erected to his memory within the church, and other marks of respect were shown in different parts of the kingdom.

The peculiar traits of his character,—his amiability in all the relations of private life, his affection for his wife and children, his generosity towards young writers, and his bitterness towards his opponents,—the habits of his mind, the changes in his opinions, and the unsatisfactory basis on which those opinions rested, have been sufficiently exhibited in the course of these remarks. Of his position as a poet and prose-writer, and the general characteristics of his works, we may possibly have an opportunity to speak hereafter. But it will not be out of place to observe now, that, notwithstanding the great number of his publications, it is exceedingly doubtful whether he will maintain as high a place in the regards of future generations as he held in those of the last. Some of his works

* Vol. VI. p. 389.

will doubtless live and be admired always; but others have already been forgotten, and many more, we believe, will follow. Upon a careful estimate of what he has done, it is not believed that his name will hold a very high place among the illustrious writers whom his country has produced.

c. c. s.

ART. V. — JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

It is evident that the doctrine of "justification by faith" was, to the Apostle Paul, one of the distinguishing peculiarities of the Gospel as a practical system, if it was not the central principle of spiritual life. Whatever theory we adopt as to the extent of the great Apostle's inspiration, and the relation of his Epistles to the Saviour's words as authority in religious matters, the views of Paul must possess a great interest for every earnest Christian student, and every devout mind will feel more at ease, at least, to know that its own religious convictions are not opposed to those of the chief missionary of the Church. In regard to the doctrine of justification by faith, however, the difficulty of reaching the precise meaning of the Apostle is almost equal to the interest of the inquiry. In none of the Epistles is the subject developed systematically; it is only sketched, and rapidly presented; and all the passages that primarily relate to it would not, if arranged consecutively, equal the Epistle to Titus in extent.

We shall not find unanimity of opinion in relation to the doctrine among those Christian thinkers and commentators who consider that they are the patrons of it. As a general thing, however, orthodox believers consent in maintaining that Paul's theory is based on a sacrificial scheme of redemption, and implies that wonderful compromise between Divine justice and mercy by which, through the death of Christ, the sinner may receive pardon and be accounted just in the sight of God. According to this interpretation, the world, until the birth of Christ, was under a system of law, and only by perfect obedience to every demand of the law and every intimation of

conscience, could any soul expect any favor from the Almighty. God could not pardon the sins of men consistently with his equity, and since each sin deserved eternal penalties, the whole race was drifting swiftly to ruin. But the abasement, toil, sufferings, and death of Jesus lifted us out of the dominion of law;—some say, because he paid the penalties that were due; others say, because God's abhorrence of sin was sufficiently *expressed* in the degradation and agonies of the Saviour;—and thus a way was opened for a safe and consistent exercise of God's mercy, in the forgiveness of our transgressions. Instead of a keeping of the law, faith in Christ as a Saviour was substituted as the condition of acceptance, and all who acknowledge their depravity and moral impotence, and cling to Jesus as the Redeemer, will receive pardon, and experience "justification by faith."

Such is the logical skeleton of the prevalent theory, divested of those graces of rhetoric which have so often concealed the severity of its outlines, and that spirit of humility, reverence, and piety with which the lives of the best Christians have associated it.

It has always seemed to us a sufficient refutation of this version of Paul's doctrine, that it is opposed to the plainest principles of the Old Testament,—the literature of that very system of rigid law under which it is said the race was held before the coming of Christ. According to the sacrificial theory of justification by faith, the *peculiarity* of the Gospel lies in its offer of forgiveness, and its disclosure of terms by which pardon is possible on the part of God. But in the light of such a theory what shall we do with the Psalms and the prophetic books? Are they not distinguished for their rapturous descriptions of the joys of pardon, and their promises of forgiveness if men will repent? "The Lord," said David, "is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of a contrite spirit." He even went so far as to say, "There is forgiveness with thee that thou mayest be feared." Isaiah, too, declared, among many other equally solemn and decisive passages, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." If we could bring together all the pas-

sages from the religious books of the Old Testament that bear upon this point, we should see that the Old Testament contains far more declarations of God's free mercy, and his willingness to pardon, than the New. Promises of God's favor are sprinkled upon its pages as thick and as brilliant as the stars that gem the night-heaven. Its inspired men plainly knew nothing of any conflict of Divine attributes, and they never coupled the exercise of mercy and forgiveness with any other condition than simple penitence.

Is it said, that these promises of pardon in the Old Testament were made to Jews who had an anticipation of the sacrificial death of Jesus, and were grounded on their fore-looking faith in that sacrifice? It is sufficient to give either of three replies to such a statement. First, that no such condition is ever mentioned, implied, or hinted by the Old Testament writers. Second, that pardon was granted to heathen nations, such as the Ninevites, who could have had no fore-looking to Christ, on the simple condition of repentance. Third, that the Jewish nation had so little anticipation of the atoning death of the Saviour, as a discharge of any debt to Divine justice, that the one thing which they could not comprehend about him when he came, and which shattered the hopes of his own disciples, was how their Messiah could die at all. "We have heard out of the law," they said, "that Christ abideth for ever; and how sayest thou the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" "The cross of Christ," that is, the ignoble death of Christ, "was *to the Jews* a stumbling-block," as well as "to the Greeks foolishness." The prevalent theory of justification by faith should be supported by a background of shadows in the Old Testament on the question of pardon, but upon that point the Old Testament is light.

It is not necessary for us to dwell long upon the point, that this common view of Paul's doctrine is inconsistent with the Saviour's teachings respecting Divine forgiveness, and his own relations to our spiritual welfare. We know that he said nothing about the impossibility of pardon except on the ground of an atoning sacrifice and our appropriation of it through faith. There are passages which speak of his taking away the sin of the world, and

which declare that whoso "believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life"; but no person would think of finding a sacrificial theory of forgiveness and justification in them. It is sufficient to allude to a few of the prominent instances in which the Saviour refers to the Divine mercy, in order to show how hostile such a theory is to the spirit of his instructions. Among the first declarations of his first discourse are the words, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." We read, too, the language, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" We are taught, in the Lord's prayer, to ask forgiveness directly from the Father's mercy, not on condition of a substituted punishment, or any vicarious sufferings that open the way for the exercise of mercy. In the parable of the prodigal, do we not read, that as soon as the prodigal was penitent, and when he was "a great way off," the father's arms were opened, and he ran that he might welcome him? In the case of the Pharisee and publican, is it not said that the latter went down to his house "justified," after his sincere petition, "Lord be merciful to me a sinner"? And Jesus prayed for the forgiveness of his murderers, not on the ground of his own sacrifice, but because "they know not what they do." It is plainly impossible to reconcile the doctrinal substratum of the common views of justification by faith with the fundamental religious principles of the Psalms, the Prophets, and the four Gospels, and however we may wish to honor Paul, it is too dangerous, at least, to ascribe to him a theory which stands prominent by reason of such high relief from the rest of Scripture.

But great injustice is done to the doctrine of Paul by connecting it with such a theory of forgiveness, and the offer of any equivalent or legal tender to the Divine law for our transgressions. To his mind justification by faith was connected with a new and quickening revelation of God which Christianity brought. This new conception of God stood in total contrast to the Pharisaism in which he had been educated. We must study his doctrine, as it seems to us, with constant reference to the *Pharisaism* of his day, rather than to the *Judaism* of the Old Testament.

There is a world-wide difference between the ideas and spirit of the two systems, — a difference as great as that which separates a modern Portuguese Catholic priest from the spiritual state of a man like St. Augustine. That struggle, which is apparent enough in the Old Testament, of the prophetic against the priestly tendencies, of the living spirit against the technical forms of religion, had ceased. In Pharisaism the legal and ritual tendency culminated and triumphed. The feeling of joyful and vivifying *personal* relations with the Deity was lost. Traditionalism, as always happens, ended with stifling the life of the traditions themselves. The Pharisaic systems were as void of every thing that could impart and foster piety, as a mummy is empty of blood. The great Rabbis could tell the number of letters in each chapter of Moses ; could give a fantastical interpretation of the plainest matters of fact in Jewish history ; could inform their scholars as to the relative importance of the commandments, and teach them how to compound for remissness in one by extraordinary diligence with another ; could give directions how to wash the hands before eating, and demonstrate the importance of pouring the water first upon the elbow, and letting it run off the ends of the fingers ; could give minute directions about times of fasting, and the way of wearing sackcloth, and the manner of paying tithes, and the breadth and style of phylacteries, and the propriety of divorce, if a wife oversalted her husband's food ; could show the necessity of stopping all work when the hour of prayer arrived, the reasons for reciting eighteen prayers a day, the number of cubits to be walked before a new one was commenced, and the proper forms of ejaculation if one suddenly came to a place where a miracle had been done, or idolatry rooted out, or if a dwarf, a negro, or a maimed man was encountered in the streets. The foundation of this theory of religion was the idea of God as the Almighty critic of human actions, and the claimant of perfect legal etiquette in every thought, and through every hour of the day. The type of character it produced may be symbolized by a stately and intricately constructed temple, in which is no hallowing presence, but where only dust and silence are about the dark and neglected shrine.

It was in the straitest sect of such a class of men that

Paul was educated. The idea of a covenant relation with God was familiar to him, by which certain favors, which it is needless here to specify, might be gained *by the Jews* on condition of strict obedience to the ritual and moral law. But the idea of any immediate communion with God, of direct, unpurchased favor from the Deity, of the intrinsic value and joyfulness of a religious state of heart, or any sense of the friendliness of God's providence, and an infinite desire in the Deity to bless and fill all the souls he had created, was what he had never dreamed. It is probable that the feeling of penitence was seldom experienced by even an earnest Pharisee, and the necessity of it did not make a vital element of their theology, so little account did they make, in their ceremonial stoicism, of spiritual life; so completely had they lost the sense of the Prophets and the Psalms; so thoroughly had they learned to materialize religion into a round of observances, undertaken for the sake of some promised benefit, and to consider God as the hard task-master and exact bargainer, who would not pay a jot, if the letter of the contract was not fulfilled.

Paul came out of these habits of thought into acquaintance with the Saviour's teachings, as one comes from a dimly lighted cave into the noonday. He learned there the parental character of God; that his spirit is ever near the soul, and his mercy infinite as his power; that he loves every spirit that exists, — Jew and Gentile; and that the soul may be conscious of that love, and live with a sense of filial fellowship with its Maker.

These truths opened a new world to him, and poured a whole tide of life into his breast. He had been an earnest man, and with his theory of religion his sins troubled him more than he could express. He felt that he was not fulfilling his own ideas of ceremonial and moral perfectness. How then could he believe that the strict, and omniscient, and all holy Jehovah regarded him as clean, and would treat him with favor? But now he found that where his chief difficulty lay, the great source of strength appeared. So far from being merely the strict scrutinizer and analyst of his deeds, God was his friend and father, and desired to have him cherish the filial temper of faith, reliance, and love, and would accept that state of heart as the great indication of loyalty, even

when the steps faltered and the will seemed weak. Thus his affections were reached, and religion became a power of life in him. Instead of looking ever at the stern standard of duty, and hearing the demands and the condemnation of the law, he could come into communion with God, as the very fountain of love and strength, and feel the invitations from heaven to a consecrated and faithful life. Sin seemed ever more heinous in his eyes than before, for it wore the same darkness as ever in the radiance of God's holiness; while the new light of God's Fatherhood was cast upon it, so that it became not only rebellion, but ingratitude. A new power, however, was imparted to his soul in the revelation of God's free goodness and paternity, which inspired his breast, and invigorated his will, gave him strange joys, turned his heart from any love of evil, and lifted him above the dominion of the law of sin and death.

It is in this connection that we shall appreciate the depth of Paul's meaning in his use of the words "grace," and "the Holy Spirit," and "the gift of the Spirit." As a Pharisee, such words could not have been received into his religious vocabulary. He had always considered himself one of a covenant people, who might expect certain favors for certain definite acts of service rendered. But, after his acquaintance with Christianity, he could speak of "access by faith to *this* grace in which we stand," and of "the *love of God* shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us." In this new manifestation of God to him he saw that his religious life would have an entirely different complexion, and be filial, not legal; liberty, not bondage; that he "should serve in the newness of the spirit, and not the oldness of the letter."

The second chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians discloses the same truth, that the peculiarity of his change from Pharisaism to Christianity consisted in the different view of God, and of relationship to God, which he obtained. From a stiff, isolated, and ritual stoic, he became a healthy mystic, and could say with a rapture that he had never felt before, "Now we have received the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." This spirit was the joyous consciousness of God's favor which quickened every spiritual nerve, and enlightened the whole na-

ture, making life and duty wear a different hue. Before, God's highest quality, to him, had been holiness which made him unapproachable, and all thought of participation in his spirit blasphemous.

But the fullest expression of these new relations which acquaintance with Christianity had disclosed, and which inspired his heart, is found in the eighth chapter of Romans. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." And the new life that had been imparted to his inward nature is suggested in the passage, "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Thus the doctrine of justification by faith, which Paul, in becoming a Christian, adopted in exchange for his Pharisaic doctrine of justification by ritual and moral works, flowed from the totally different conception of the Deity that burst upon him in his conversion. It was the practical statement of the truth that God is not only the moral Governor, but the Father; it was the confession that, being children of God, and not his servants, we should *live* as his children, in love of him and confidence towards him, whatever be the course of his providence; since it is this spirit that he demands first of all, and this spirit alone that can purify character at its springs, and give us power and peace in all the trials and temptations, the darkness and sorrows, of life.

It remains now to speak of the relations which Christ sustains to this justification by faith. So far from its being true, that this faith, according to Paul, must be connected in any way with a placating sacrifice and cancelling death of Jesus, any such hypothesis, as it seems to us, stands in direct hostility to the Apostle's vital doctrine. We are not aware that any one has ever attempted to prove from the Pauline writings that there was a

conflict of Divine attributes which made it impossible for simple penitence to avail for the pardon of sin, and which required a sacrifice to open the possibility of Divine forgiveness. That theory is one of the corollaries of the Trinity, but it has never been directly proved from the Epistles.

Paul frequently speaks of the sufferings and death of Christ in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the new mode of justification by faith. But it is in another way that he connects the two facts. The soul experiences the new life and the justification by faith when it becomes conscious of God's parental relations to it, but it can get that consciousness only through faith in Christ, that is, in the whole mission of Jesus. God sent him as the exhibition of his own spirit of mercy, as the revealer of the new religious relation into which the soul might rise, and as the pledge that all the hopes born of that new relation would be fulfilled. In speaking of Christ's death, of course the Apostle's language would take the coloring of the Jewish sacrifices, and contain metaphors borrowed from the ritual; but whatever imagery he uses, his thought always is that Christ came to *reveal*, not to purchase, God's favor to men; to commend, not to bargain for, his love; to disclose the fulness of his love, not to remove any obstructions that had hampered its exercise.

Christ abased himself from his angelic state, according to the Apostle, took our form, lived, and suffered, that the depth of God's love for men, and his displeasure at sin, and his desire to have the race united to him in filial ties, might be most impressively manifested, and operate, in harmony with the great truths he taught, to quicken the affections of men, and root out the very principle of sin. "God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" It was as a powerful declaration of God's desire to receive men to the nearest relationship and fullest communion, that he sent forth Jesus to teach, and toil, and suffer, and die. And the same truth is taught in the celebrated verses of the third chapter of Romans, "But now the righteousness of God without the law is *manifested*,"—

not bought, but manifested; and he speaks of the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth as a new Mercy-seat sprinkled with his own blood, to *declare* God's holiness and goodness in the forgiveness of sins. The forgiveness and favor of God are never spoken of as purchased by Jesus, but as revealed most vividly, in their highest form, through him; and since the soul can attain the knowledge of these relations and that inspiring disposition of God in no other way than by Christian discipleship, of course faith in the office and representative mission of Christ is the necessary condition of the possible spiritual blessings. Justification by faith is a matter directly between the soul and God, but the only way of attaining that peculiar knowledge of God, through which it could be experienced, was through entire and intense faith in Christ.

Nothing, then, as it seems to us, can be more completely opposed than the prevailing theories of Christ's mission, and Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, and his conception of the cross. They differ in form and spirit, root and branch, leaves and fruit. The one is founded on the idea of a conflict in the Divine nature, the other on the conception of God's free mercy; the one imagines that penitence of itself is unable to procure the pardon of sin, the other that God delights to receive the soul to his own fellowship, whenever it will break through its own wall of separation; the one is opposed to the plain doctrines of the Old Testament and the Gospels, the other is a clearer revelation of that mercy of which the prophets speak, and a new setting of the great truth taught by Jesus, — the paternity of God.

There are many other points of view from which the doctrine of justification by faith is presented in Paul's Epistles, such as his criticism of the history of Abraham, and his argument for the equal privileges of the Gentiles, — all of which illustrate and confirm the interpretation we have given; but it is not necessary to occupy more space with them here. We will only allude to the fact, that this theory of justification by faith is in harmony with the deepest Christian experience. All the spiritual life produced by the vicarious systems, we believe, is produced by the intense conception of Christ's free sacrifice and boundless love for the soul. This is, no doubt, most

deeply felt, and, as Christ is regarded in such systems as God, it is really the feeling of God's love and yearning towards our nature that fosters the highest and purest piety of the Trinitarian sects, — the same doctrine which Paul taught, and which belongs, or should belong, devoid of the Trinitarian absurdities, to the essence of every religious system.

There is no other spring of free spiritual life than the doctrine and the consciousness of justification by faith. No man can reach a perfect standard of duty, nor is there any standard nor any law so unchanging, that it will not rise into new loftiness as the soul spiritually ascends. If we stand outside the sphere of the spirit of God, and feel the eye of his holiness upon us, and have no other guide but conscience and the written law, we cannot have any satisfaction, any religious repose, any inward joy. The more intense the realization of God, the deeper the unrest. The Christian life is born of another experience, — the sense of God's paternal relations to us, the surrender of ourselves to him in a filial temper, the desire through prayerfulness and communion to live by his guidance, the disposition that manifests itself in penitence as in faithfulness, and the assurance that he will bless our aspirations, approve our struggles, and mercifully distinguish between failure of strength and disloyalty of will. In such an experience we are in harmony with Paul, and have an inward consciousness of justification by faith.

T. S. K.

ART. VI. — THE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY OF
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

IN all ages of the world, and in all countries with which we are conversant, the firmament has been contemplated with awe. "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge; there is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." The handiwork of Omnipotence is recognized by the savage and the sage, — the shepherds of Asia and the *savans* of Europe.

The vast accessions to our stock of astronomical knowledge which have distinguished the last half-century, and the deep and abiding interest which these acquirements have inspired on this side of the Atlantic, have necessarily given to institutions, strictly astronomical, a position and a value, to which a just view of their importance, in most of the great concerns of life, has at all times entitled them. In tracing the progress of American discoveries, we can scarcely persuade ourselves that only twenty-five years have elapsed since President John Quincy Adams, in his first annual message to Congress, urged upon that most unscientific body the establishment of a national observatory. At that period, as was stated by the President, while on the comparatively small territorial surface of Europe there were one hundred and thirty observatories, there was not one in our whole country; important as was the science to the growing commerce of the country, "year after year the earth rolled on in perpetual darkness to the unsearching eyes of one half of the globe." Still more difficult it is to believe, that this proposition, fraught as it was with the characteristic ardor of that illustrious patron of science, met only with the ridicule of the country. Length of days, however, enabled the veteran to sweep the heavens with his own eye, in his own State, by means vying with those of all Europe.

The establishment of an astronomical observatory connected with Harvard University was an early proposition of the late Dr. Bowditch, and a committee, consisting of himself and Professor Farrar, was appointed in the year 1816, to procure instruments in view of the immediate erection of a suitable building. The present Director of the Observatory, being about to visit England, was requested by the Corporation of the College to examine some observatories in that country, and to obtain plans and estimates adapted to the wants of the institution. This was done, and the result was reported to the College government; but it being impossible to secure the services of the first workmen in Europe, the whole matter was permitted to rest. In 1823, and again in 1825, President Adams, then Secretary of State, urged upon the Corporation the erection of a building, even though instruments could not be immediately procured, and, to promote this

end, he proposed at both these periods to subscribe one thousand dollars himself, provided the requisite sum could be raised ;* but the attempt proving ineffectual, no further action was had till the autumn of 1839. To astronomers, William C. Bond, Esq., of Dorchester, had been long favorably known as a skilful and diligent observer. With a few instruments, in a retired but beautiful position, "the world forgetting," he spent much of the night in observing and collecting celestial phenomena ; and though closely occupied during the day in an arduous calling in the city of Boston, no eclipse or occultation escaped his attention. The authorities at Washington had secured his services in a series of astronomical and magnetic observations, corresponding with those which were to be made by the Exploring Expedition. These, with only a trifling remuneration, aided by a much lamented son, he was prosecuting with unparalleled zeal, when the Corporation of the College, at the suggestion of President Quincy, proposed to him, with the consent of the United States government, to transfer all his instruments and apparatus to Cambridge. He yielded to this plan without prospect of pecuniary reward, and though a mere fraction of the observations made here and at Dorchester has been published, the volumes of the Transactions of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences bear testimony to an unexampled amount of labor. His hopes, however, rested upon the prospect, which he has since happily realized, of having at some day the management of such instruments as his gifts as an observer and skill in the adjustment of instruments justly entitled him to enjoy, and which would render him useful to science. A convenient house was procured near the Colleges, and smaller buildings were erected on the surrounding grounds for the transit and magnetic observations. The instruments conveyed from Dorchester, the property of the observer, consisted of an excellent four-foot transit, still in good condition, an altitude and azimuth instrument, one or two achromatics, a Gauss declination magnetometer, a magnetic dip circle, a sidereal clock, besides chronometers, and the usual meteorological instruments. In addition to these, the American

* President Quincy's History of Harvard University, Vol. II. p. 567.

Academy had purchased a set of Lloyd's magnetic apparatus, and placed it at the disposal of W. C. Bond. Thus equipped, the course of observations consisted of the transit of stars for time and the correction of instrumental errors, moon culminations with moon-culminating stars carried through the entire lunations, occultations of stars by the moon, monthly term-day observations of Lloyd's declination instrument, and horizontal and vertical force magnetometer continued through the whole twenty-four hours. The latter were made by the Gauss magnetometer, and sometimes in connection with Lloyd's. Meteorological observations were constantly kept up, and a part of the time were made hourly. In the magnetic observations the Messrs. Bond were occasionally assisted by Professors Peirce and Lovering; but the entire family of the Director were occasionally pressed into the service, though the chief aid was derived from the eldest son. This excellent youth devoted the brief period of his existence to the promotion of his father's wishes, and the amount of his labors and the accuracy of his results will be an enduring monument to his fidelity, as well as to his skill and application. Death deprived the father of the services of the son in November, 1842. His place has been admirably filled by his brother, George P. Bond, of whom we are soon to speak.

A part of the astronomical observations made at this establishment have been published monthly in the Proceedings of the American Academy. Copies of a greater number, however, are in the hands of Captain Wilkes of the Exploring Expedition, and of Sears C. Walker, Esq., of the Coast Survey, to be used in the determination of the longitude of various stations on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Some of the magnetic observations are contained in the Memoirs of the Academy, and some have been published by Colonel Sabine; but much the larger portion remains unpublished.

Neither the Corporation of the College, nor the friends of astronomical science generally, were satisfied with the telescopes which had been placed at the disposal of Mr. Bond. Indeed, the College had hitherto furnished no instrument better than those removed from Dorchester, and even the contingent expenses of the establishment were paid from the personal resources of the Direc-

tor. This was no less a source of uneasiness to the College than to the Observer, and at length it was concluded to erect a building suitable for the accommodation of an Equatorial Refractor of the largest class, and forthwith to order the instrument. This design was largely promoted by the appearance of the great comet of 1843. The limits of this article will not admit of a detail of the steps that were taken to effect this desirable object. It is sufficient for our purpose, however, to say, what indeed is known to the friends of the Observatory, that the expense of the present institution was met by the united contributions of the College and of the American Academy, and by individuals, friends of science, citizens of Boston and its vicinity, desirous of securing the services of the present Director.

The building is beautifully situated on an eminence fifty feet above the level of the surrounding country, and distant three quarters of a mile in a northwest direction from the College buildings. The edifice, consisting hitherto of the centre building or tower surmounted by the dome which covers the Great Refractor, with one wing only, has presented an awkward appearance; but the other wing is now in progress, and when completed, the whole will present an appropriate and imposing aspect. On entering the lower apartment of the Observatory proper, the stranger is surprised that his progress is arrested by a prodigious circular mass of masonry. This is the pier for the support of the Grand Equatorial, the great step-stone of the work. The reader will perceive the necessity of this solid base, when he calls to mind the fact, that the slightest tremor, when magnified by the power of the instrument, becomes of sufficient moment to vitiate entirely the delicate determinations of the observer. To obviate this difficulty, an excavation was first made twenty-six feet below the natural summit of the hill, and at the bottom of this was placed a coating of cement intermixed with coarse gravel ten feet in thickness, which, when hardened, formed an entire mass of great firmness. On this bed the pier, composed of five hundred tons of large granite blocks well fitted to each other and laid in cement, rises thirty-three feet to the upper surface of the floor of the dome. On the capstone of this rests, on three bearers, a solid granite tripod

or pedestal, of eleven tons' weight, to the top of which is attached the Great Equatorial, which we hasten to describe, passing over most of the minor instruments of the Observatory. We have no hope, however, of doing any thing like justice to this noble instrument, which, in connection with all the apparatus of the Observatory then in use, is described scientifically by Mr. W. C. Bond in a memoir communicated to the Academy in November, 1848.

The Great Refractor was made by Merz & Mahler, the successors of the celebrated Frauenhofer, at Munich. It is the largest refracting telescope in the world; when finished, it was thought by the makers to be the best, and, if we can judge of its merits by its performance, we must concur in their opinion. Its only possible rival is that at Pulkova, which it somewhat exceeds in effective aperture, that at Cambridge having fourteen and ninety-five hundredths inches. Its focal length is twenty-two feet eight inches, and it is mounted equatorially on the German plan. It is furnished with eighteen eye-pieces. These consist of four annular micrometers, with powers as determined by the Director ranging from 103 to 373, five plain eye-pieces, with powers from 222 to 1,118, and nine spider-line micrometers, with powers from 141 to 2,004. The field-view of the latter is only a single minute of arc, somewhat less than a thirtieth of the moon's apparent diameter. The motion of the earth, which, with ordinary instruments, is constantly throwing the object out of the field, is here counteracted by clock-work, which communicates sidereal motion to the telescope. The defining excellence of this telescope is without example; with a power of two thousand, the *disks* of the satellites of Jupiter and that of Neptune have been well shown. With a power of eight hundred, stars have been separated, whose measured distance was only three tenths of a second. With this telescope the edge of Saturn's ring never disappears.

It reflects great credit upon the manufacturer, trifling as the fact may seem, that the packing of this instrument, with all its complicated and delicate machinery, was performed in such a manner as to secure its safety through the various modes of conveyance necessary in its journey from Munich. The granite pedestal, already alluded to, and to which the bed-plate of the equatorial mounting of the

telescope is attached, was prepared previously to the arrival of the telescope, and the mounting of the instrument, with all its equatorial and clock-work movements, attests the skill of the Director. Indeed, his mechanical gifts, and judgment in the adjustment of instruments of every description, have at all times given him an acknowledged advantage over most observers in this country and in Europe. His anxiety during the long period of its manufacture had impressed upon his mind's eye as perfect an image of every joint and screw and pinion as was subsequently impressed on his retina in the Observatory. The weight of the telescope, with its iron diaphragms and brass strengthening-rods, is upwards of three tons, and yet the friction is so successfully relieved by the judicious arrangement of wheels and counterpoises, that the finger of a child may change its direction. The improvements which the Director has made in the observing-chair must be gratifying to every one who has witnessed the awkward and painful twisting to which observers are usually subjected, especially in observations on zenith objects. It is ingeniously balanced by weights suspended by chains constructed in the manner of the *fusee* chain of a watch. It moves horizontally on rails of round inch-iron let into the floor of the dome, and the observer is enabled with perfect ease, at all times, without leaving his seat, or disturbing the chronometer which may lie beside him, to move the chair round on the railway, adjust his position in altitude, and change at pleasure the direction of the telescope.

Of the instruments of less magnitude, besides those brought from Dorchester, the most important are an excellent five-foot achromatic, mounted in a detached building, a comet-seeker by Merz, so fruitful in the hands of the younger Bond, and a transit-circle on the plan of that successfully used by Groombridge at Blackheath.

We come now to the results of the labor in the discoveries which have been made during the short period in which the instruments have been in working order. In discussing these, which we shall do briefly, it must be borne in mind, that the entire force employed in the Observatory, till within the last six months, has consisted of the Director, William C. Bond, assisted by his son, George P. Bond. The latter, a graduate of the Univer-

sity, had already distinguished himself as a mathematician, and though young has communicated several learned memoirs to the American Academy and other institutions. Their first labors were necessarily directed to the minute determination of the latitude and the longitude of the Observatory. In doing this, the wide difference between the skill and labor requisite in the minute determination of these elements, and that employed by the navigator or the geographer, must be understood and appreciated. An approximate result is all that is ever obtained at sea, except it be by accident. Observations of this kind are deemed of no importance to the Observatory. The position of the Observatory is the starting-point in all future time, and to obtain it with sufficient accuracy is a work of magnitude. For their latitude, besides various other methods, they obtained three hundred prime-vertical observations, and for their longitude, the transit of six hundred moon-culminating stars, two hundred occultations of stars by the moon, and all the visible eclipses that have occurred in clear weather. Besides these, the Director has been engaged, the last two years, for the service and at the expense of the Coast Survey, in accumulating results from chronometers of his own and those belonging to the Cunard line of steamers for relative longitude; and in order to obtain the best determination of local time at Liverpool, an arrangement was last year made with the Director of the new observatory of that city, who has obligingly taken charge of all the chronometers. The number of results hitherto made is one hundred and seventy-five by fifty chronometers in thirteen voyages. It may well be conceded that the data obtained by this variety of means, so multiplied, should entitle the Observatory to be considered the standard of longitude on this side of the Atlantic. Perhaps there is no spot on the whole face of the earth whose position is so accurately determined.

An immense labor has been involved in the examination of nebulae, as appears by the papers on this subject in the transactions of the American Academy. The well-known nebula of Andromeda and that of Orion were fields of special labor. Both of these nebulae have interested astronomers from early times; that in Andromeda long before the invention of the telescope. In Septem-

ber, 1847, very soon after the adjustment of the Great Refractor was completed, an examination of this interesting object was commenced, when it was found to have an immense number of stars scattered over its surface, and seeming to have no connection with it. Fifteen hundred were found to be within its limits; but the most remarkable features, now for the first time presented to the human eye, were two narrow, dark bands, in which no deviation from perfect straightness could be detected, and scarcely any deviation from parallelism. These bands stretched quite across the field of vision and through the entire nebula in the direction of the longer axis. In view of the distance of this nebula assigned to it by Sir W. Herschel, the younger Bond has estimated the length of these bands to be twenty times the distance of Sirius from the solar system. These phenomena have been since observed by Lord Rosse, and made the subject of an address to the British Association.

With regard to the great nebula of Orion, the public are already aware that the observers at Cambridge discovered very early after mounting the great telescope, that, in common with most nebulae, this also was composed of the blended light of an infinite number of stars clustering in obedience to some law, or in accidental juxtaposition. The Director has more recently subjected this beautiful nebula to rigorous scrutiny, and communicated his results in a learned memoir to the Academy, with a catalogue of the stars embraced in it and having no connection with its nebulosity. By means of this catalogue, and the maps and telescopic views which both observers have drawn, they have detected three new stars near the trapezium, and ascertained the curious fact, that one star in its neighbourhood of the sixteenth magnitude is variable in its light; at its minimum entirely disappearing. Probably this is the only variable telescopic star known, and extends this curious property to a very distant region. Other nebulae and clusters have engaged the attention of the observers at Cambridge, and among their diagrams they have completed a map of every star steadily visible by the Great Refractor in the cluster in Hercules, with a view of ascertaining, at a distant day, their relative motions and configuration.

At different periods through the years 1847 and 1848,

laborious observations were made upon the satellite of Neptune near the time of its greatest elongation, for the determination of its mean distance from the primary, in view of ascertaining the mass of Neptune as well as the orbit of the satellite. And although the results of Professor Peirce, as derived from these observations when compared with those of Professor Struve, have been the subject of criticism, their close agreement, when we consider the delicacy of these measures upon these exceedingly minute and immensely distant objects, may be placed, as it has been by Professor Peirce, among the wonders of modern astronomical observations.

On the 16th day of September, 1848, the younger Bond discovered a point of light, resembling a star of the seventeenth magnitude, in the plane of Saturn's ring, between two of the well-known satellites of that planet. He entered this upon his diagram of stars and satellites at the time in that region. On the 18th it was seen by both the observers, and by both recorded with expressions of doubt as to its true character. On the 19th their micro-metrical determinations indicated that it partook of the retrograde motion of Saturn, and no doubt remained that this object was a satellite of Saturn hitherto unknown to the world. It is very remarkable that this discovery should also have been made by Mr. Lassell of Liverpool only two days later, and we deem it quite as remarkable, and a matter of surprise, that the English astronomers claim the honor of this discovery. If the question be asked, Who saw it first? the answer from all parties must be, George P. Bond; and if it be asked, Who saw it next? the answer must be, William C. Bond; but the clew on which the British astronomers rest their claim is, that Lassell made a map of its position relative to the other satellites on the 18th. But the Bonds made "careful measurements" on the same day. Who ever thought of withholding from Sir William Herschel the credit of the discovery of Uranus, because he at first supposed it to be a comet, and because it was reserved for another observer to detect its true character many months afterwards? The editor of the *London Athenæum*, who never forgets the claims of England, maintains that there was no priority in either observer as to the first suspicion that the object was a satellite, and plausibly recommends

that the English say it was discovered by Bond and Lassell; the Americans, by Lassell and Bond. We do not assent to this. Bond saw the object and mapped it on the 16th; and both observers detected its true character on the 19th.

A multitude of observations have been made upon the changes in the belts of the planet Jupiter. These were taken during the years 1848 and 1849, when the planet was favorably seen in high northern declination. Changes in these and in the relative brightness of the satellites have been mapped out by the observers, with explanatory notes, exhibiting very interesting phenomena. In the prosecution of this inquiry, the elder Bond on one occasion saw an eclipse of the first satellite in the shadow of the third, both satellites being off the planet, and both shadows on, a circumstance necessarily of rare occurrence, and probably never before seen.

Drawings of the solar spots, which were observed on every clear day through the apparent annual revolution of the sun, have been made at the Observatory, and, when collected with the notes and explanations which accompany them, will furnish new data for the determination of the period of his rotation, and will contribute also to an explanation of those mysterious appearances.

Very valuable observations for the determination of the sun's parallax were made on the planet Mars in November and December, 1849, and January, 1850, during the opposition of the planet. Its position relative to the best situated fixed stars within the range of the micrometer of the Great Refractor was carefully measured every morning and evening. By allowing for the motion of the planet in the interval between the morning and evening measurement, they obtain the sum of its parallaxes, east and west, a quantity two or three times larger than the sun's parallax, which they propose to obtain from it. This method has been aforetime practised for the determination of the parallax of a comet while circumpolar; but never, we believe, for that of the sun. It is plain that, by taking advantage of the earth's rotation to carry them from one extremity to the other of a chord of about five thousand miles, they obtain the parallax of Mars as effectually as by the removal of the telescope to an equally distant point of the earth. For this class of ob-

servations, nothing can be more opportune than the electric clock, aided by the spring governor, a late invention of the Director, of which we have yet to speak. By means of this they can reckon on two or three thousand measurements for a night and morning's work of two hours each. Such a set of determinations, thus multiplied, will afford them as accurate a determination of the sun's parallax as can be obtained by a transit of Venus, and may be repeated as often as desired.

Eleven comets had been discovered by the Assistant Observer, George P. Bond, before receiving any intelligence of their having been seen elsewhere. Nine of these were strictly telescopic, — a greater number, it is believed, than has ever been discovered by any unassisted individual, except the celebrated Messier. With some of these, as with the satellite of Saturn, the European observations were nearly simultaneous; indeed, the comet of June 3, 1845, and that of April 11, 1849, were both discovered here and in Europe on the same day and at the same hour of local time, the priority being only equivalent to the difference of longitude. The first of these, which has been claimed by Professor Colla of Parma, and distinguished by his name, is another instance of European injustice. Both observers saw it on the morning of June 3d, civil reckoning. Colla obtained no observation of its place, merely stating it was in Perseus, and no European observations were made earlier than on the 7th; but the Bonds had good places on the 2d, 4th, and 6th, astronomical time, and it was subsequently proved that a Southern gentleman of this country saw it on the last day of the previous month. And yet this comet is called Colla's comet throughout Europe, and the Professor has claimed, and it is supposed obtained, the medal of the king of Denmark, although beyond question this was an American discovery. Stricter justice, however, is done in reference to the discovery of the comet of the 29th of August of last year. The priority of George P. Bond is acknowledged in Europe, and this comet is distinguished by his name.

Besides the elements of the comets discovered by himself, this young man has calculated those of twenty other comets, as well as the orbit of Neptune and that of the new satellite of Saturn. Those only who have per-

formed this operation can be sensible either of its labor or intricacy, and to those who are entirely familiar with the methods, the great liability to errors which are fatal to the results renders it at least a very perplexing problem.

We come now to the discovery of the new ring of Saturn, one of the greatest discoveries of the present age, and the highest proof of the excellence of the Great Refractor. During the last autumn, Saturn being favorably situated, the observers were perplexed with an appearance connected with this planet which was entirely new. This was a dark line bordering the inner edge of the ring projected with the shadow of the ring upon the body of the planet. At first they supposed this phenomenon had some connection with the shadow; but it could be traced on some occasions throughout the entire circumference of the ring, and on the inner answer of the old ring presented an edging of faint light. Suspecting its true character, the question remained unsettled till the beautiful night of November 15th. It was quite calm, the sky being just hazed over with thin cirrus. Saturn was on the meridian, and was probably never before so well seen. All doubt of the existence of a ring interior to any hitherto known was at once removed. The younger Bond has prepared a faithful drawing of its appearance on that occasion, it being exceedingly rare that an opportunity so favorable occurs. It has been intimated that the Cambridge observers have been anticipated in this discovery by several astronomers; but it is not so. The mistake originates in confounding a plurality of divisions of the old ring (which is all they profess to have seen) with the new ring. Encke's article in the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, No. 338, has been cited as anticipating the Cambridge discovery; but it contains not a word about a new ring inside of the old one. It simply intimates, what has been several times done, that there are glimpses of divisions in the old rings. He puts the inner diameter of the old ring at $26''.76$ at Saturn's mean distance, agreeing precisely with the Cambridge measurement, and also with that of Professor Struve. Now the diameter of the inside of the new ring is only $23''.3$. To suppose an error of this magnitude is absurd. The breadth of the new ring is somewhat less than that of

the outer of the two old rings. Its light is very much fainter, an interesting peculiarity; and hence it is that in crossing the bright planet it is distinctly visible as an exceedingly narrow dark line.

It may be asked why these discoveries were not before made. To satisfy this inquiry, it is sufficient to say, that at no time, since the mounting of the Great Equatorial, had the earth been so favorably situated, in reference to the plane of Saturn's ring, as when these discoveries were made.

We have spoken of the application of the "Spring Governor," an invention of the Director, and for which he has received the gold medal of the Massachusetts Mechanic Association. It was made in the Observatory under the eye of the Director, and owes much of its mechanical excellence to the skill of his son, Richard Bond. The importance of this instrument, in faithfully recording observations communicated by electro-magnetism, cannot be spoken of in exaggerated terms.

Magnetic wires, connected with the telegraph lines, and corresponding with the principal cities of the United States, had been brought into the transit building at the request of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey; but the confusion in the second marks made it nearly hopeless to expect any thing from the method of observing by electro-magnetism beyond a few experiments, as the difficulty of reading off the observations was more than the labor of obtaining them. This difficulty the Spring Governor has entirely overcome. It is a system of clock-work, regulating the rotary motion of a cylinder in such a manner that its revolutions shall be performed in a given time. The cylinder is of wood, with paper drawn smoothly over it. An hour's observations are recorded on a single sheet, and when removed from the cylinder, the minutes and seconds appear entered in regular horizontal and vertical columns, and may be read off by the eye without the slightest danger of confusion or inaccuracy. After the necessary preparation in the Director's office or elsewhere, the observer repairs to the dome, unattended if he please, adjusts the telescope to the position of a star night or day; in a moment, the object by the motion of the earth enters the field of view, and approaches the vertical wires in the focus of the telescope.

At the instant the star passes the wire, (his finger being previously placed upon the *break-circuit key*, attached to the observing chair,) he suddenly presses downward, and this simple movement being repeated at the transit of each wire, he returns to the office, and the minute, second, and part of a second of each event are there recorded as by magic. It is not important that the recording cylinder should be near, so long as the connection is perfect. Theoretically, it may be carried around the world, and practically to places quite remote.

In making this hasty sketch of the condition of this prosperous institution, we have passed over a multitude of observations and labors of less importance to science than those we have enumerated, yet not less necessary in the daily routine of duty; but we trust enough has been said to satisfy the generous contributors to this Observatory, that the best ends have been accomplished by their means, and we doubt not they will concur with us in the opinion, that, if we except the discovery of the planet Neptune, — which, as a mere discovery by the telescope, claims but little credit, — if we except this, the original discoveries made at this Observatory since its establishment are scarcely excelled by those of the whole world beside in the same period of time.

No one who is not familiar with the duties of an observatory can be sensible of the labor, the intense anxiety, the continual disappointments, watchings, and privations, to which the practical astronomer is subjected; and we know of no living man who has done so much drudgery for science, with so slight a reward, as William C. Bond. But a better day is dawning upon the father and the son. Edward Bromfield Phillips, a young man of fortune, a graduate of the University, a classmate and a friend of the younger Bond, died a few years since, leaving a bequest to the Observatory of one hundred thousand dollars, as a perpetual capital fund, the interest to be applied annually for the payment of the salary of the observers, or for instruments, or a library for the use of the Observatory, at the *discretion* of the Corporation of the College, who are made the trustees of the fund. It was an act of great discretion in this young man to place the funds in the control of persons who would be likely to be faithful in the execution of his wishes. With this

provision, and with that countenance and sympathy of the officers of the College which they have always enjoyed, the observers at Cambridge can scarcely fail to enlarge the bounds of science, and render themselves useful to the world.

W. M.

ART. VII. — THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW ON HUNGARY.*

If any evidence were wanting beside that which is offered in the plain facts of the case, to prove how completely the cause of Hungary is identified with the cause of popular rights, this evidence would be found in the alarm which the prospect of the reëstablishment of that country excited in the despots and bureaucrats of Europe, the zeal and unanimity with which, from the first, their partisans assailed the patriotic movement there, and the paramount importance which they have attached to the Hungarian struggle over the other wars which agitated Europe in 1848 and 1849. They felt that the contest in Hungary was one which, in a peculiar manner, claimed the sympathy of free nations, and of those who desired or hoped for freedom, and that it threatened, in its double character of a war for freedom, and a war for constitutional rights and the integrity of a state, to enlist on its side men of all shades of liberal opinion, from the ultra radical to the moderate conservative. It was therefore found especially necessary to misrepresent the character of this war. This has been done systematically and most audaciously. It has been represented, on the one hand, as the result of a disorganizing and subversive movement, in order thus to excite the apprehensions of the adherents of the established order; while, on the other, to detach from the Hungarians the sympa-

* 1. *North American Review*, January, 1850. "*The War of Races in Hungary.*"

2. *North American Review*, April, 1850. "*The Politics of Europe.*"

3. *North American Review*, January, 1851. "*The Rebellion of the Sclavonic, Wallachian, and German Hungarians against the Magyars.*"

thies of the friends of freedom and progress, the contest which they so heroically maintained has been declaimed against as the attempt of an ambitious race, while securing their own independence, to usurp unjust dominion over their fellow-countrymen.

Neither of these charges can stand for a moment, when brought into comparison with the actual facts. The Hungarians desired no violent revolution. They wished, not the overthrow of their institutions, but their purification. They did not seek to expel their kings, but only to force them to the observance of their coronation oath. When blow after blow, beginning with the February revolution in France, was struck at the foundations of royal power in Europe, the Hungarians did not avail themselves of this season of imperial helplessness to revenge the wrongs and perfidies of centuries, and give the last impulse to the tottering throne. The revolution which they accomplished was a peaceful and bloodless one, conducted strictly within the bounds of law. They acquired by it only the possession of those rights which their constitution, and the terms of the compact in which the king was bound with his people, ought long before to have secured to them, and the guarantee of such an independence of the Austrian cabinet as was essential to the well-being of the country. Many causes combined to give to the Hungarian revolution of March, 1848, this character of moderation. The respect for law which has always distinguished the Hungarians, their generosity, and their high sense of national honor, had each a share in this result. The compact, whose fulfilment they had been so long vainly urging, it was not for them to violate, when fortune had placed them in the superior position, and had put it in their power to retaliate the faithlessness from which they had suffered. The Hungarians had never been known, in past times, to desert their king in his need; they had even disdained to extort from his distress concessions which they preferred to owe to his gratitude, when the return of the prosperity which their blood and wealth had aided to purchase should leave him leisure to reward — or to forget their sacrifices. Some of the most glorious recollections of their history were associated with this chivalrous loyalty to their thankless princes. Severe and repeated disappointments

had indeed taught the Hungarians to moderate this somewhat exaggerated sentiment; but the same generosity, chastened only by this bitter experience, the same high sense of honor, directed their conduct in 1848, which had governed it in 1741 and 1809. They resolved to demand the restoration of their constitution, and to enter at once, and in full, into the possession of those rights which they had before been gradually reclaiming, year by year; but they made no encroachment on the just prerogative of the prince. Nor, while they took measures to guard the liberties of their country from foreign dangers, were they unmindful of those which threatened its prosperity from the defects of its internal political organization. At the same time that the Hungarian nobles, who then represented the nation, acquired in the grant of a responsible Hungarian ministry the guarantee of the independence of their country, they demanded and obtained the right to divest themselves of their own privileges, and to bestow upon all the inhabitants of Hungary a share in the rights and duties of citizenship. A law was passed by the Hungarian diet, and received the sanction of the king in April, 1848, which bestowed the right of suffrage, limited only by a small property qualification, on all the inhabitants of the country.* In this fact alone is found a sufficient, an incontrovertible answer to the charge that the Hungarians of the Magyar race desired to oppress their fellow-countrymen. It is absurd, on the face of things, to talk of oppression exercised by a minority in a country where universal or nearly universal suffrage prevails. If there was any thing in the laws or institutions of Hungary which was displeasing to a majority of the inhabitants, they had a safe and easy remedy. They had no occasion to resort to arms to obtain the possession of any just right: They had but to bring the question before the legislative assembly of the nation, where superiority of numbers must have decided the victory. That the leaders of the insurgents in Hungary proper and Croatia constantly refused to submit their demands to such an arbitrament, though repeatedly called upon to do so by the Hungarian ministry, is the

* The deputies to the next diet, which was assembled in July of the same year, were chosen under this law.

best proof that they knew that they had not the nation with them, and that the majority of the Slavonians and Wallachs of Hungary felt, not as Slavonians and Wallachs, but as Hungarians.

The writer of the article called "The War of Races in Hungary," in the *North American Review* for January, 1850, completely ignores the important change which took place in the representative system in Hungary in 1848. There is not an intimation given in the article that he had so much as heard of the electoral law passed by the diet in March, and sanctioned by the king in April. So far from it, he ascribes the final decision of the Hungarians to effect a complete separation from Austria to the liberal terms of that portion of the constitution octroyed by Francis Joseph, which relates to the composition of his imaginary Austrian diet.

"The constitution of the lower house in the Imperial Diet is still more fatal to the lofty pretensions of the Magyars to govern all other races and nationalities. 'The lower house proceeds from general and direct elections. The franchise belongs to every Austrian citizen who is of age,' and who pays a moderate tax, which is not in any case to exceed twenty florins, and may be as small as five florins. This is *equal* suffrage, and it certainly comes as near *universal* suffrage as any reasonable liberal could desire, considering how little experience the subjects of Austria have had in managing representative institutions. Under such a law, the 4,200,000 Magyars lose all control even of Hungary proper, which has a population of 10,500,000; the reins pass at once from their hands into those of the despised Slavonians and Wallachians, who, taken together, number over six millions. The Magyar nobility, who number about 600,000, beheld themselves reduced from a condition in which they had the entire control of public affairs to a level with the eight millions of peasants. This proud aristocracy is absolutely crushed by the genuine republicanism of the constitution. *This was the grievance* which produced the Hungarian declaration of independence, a declaration put forth by a diet constituted almost exclusively of the Magyar nobility." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. pp. 102, 103.

Is this justice to the reader who, in his confidence in the *North American Review*, applies himself to its pages in order to satisfy his mind in regard to the "nature and causes of the war in Hungary," and the "motives and aims of the belligerents," of which the Reviewer has

promised him an exposition? Could such a reader divine, from the above statement, that, nearly a year before the promulgation of the constitution of Ollmütz, the Hungarian nobles had, by their own act, placed themselves, with regard to political rights, on a level with the peasants? Could he divine that a law more liberal in its provisions than this which the Reviewer so praises was already in force in Hungary? that the deputies to this very diet which issued the manifesto of the 14th of April, were chosen under it? Yet this was the actual state of the case. If, then, this diet was "almost exclusively constituted of the Magyar nobility," it was because this nobility had so secured to itself the confidence of the people, that, after the extension of the right of suffrage, the new possessors of this right believed they could intrust their interests to no safer hands.

Neither of the writers referred to by the North American Reviewer, as his authorities, offers confirmation of his statements on this subject. Neither of them intimates that the Magyars endeavoured to secure undue political influence by a restriction of the rights of suffrage, founded on difference of race. Both De Langsdorff and Desprez (the Reviewer's authorities from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*) are advocates of what has been called the Slavonic party in Hungary, and appear to think the demands of this party to alienate from Hungary a large portion of its dominions very reasonable; but neither of them pretends that a deprivation of political rights made any part of the grounds of this intended separation. We have already seen* that De Langsdorff mentions the "*representation of the whole population, without distinction of rank or birth*,"† as among the first measures offered for the approval of the king in March, 1848. He afterwards states, that an electoral law was passed by the diet, by which "*the right of suffrage was conferred on all who possessed a capital of 300 florins*." Desprez, in an article entitled "The End of the War in Hungary,"‡ in speaking of the conduct of the Hungarian patriots in March, 1848, says:—

"Borrowing from the legislators of the West the liberal princi-

* *Christian Examiner* for November, 1850, p. 475.

† *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Octobre, 1848.

‡ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1^{er} Septembre, 1849.

ples sprung from the French Revolution, they proclaimed equality of civil and political rights. Instead of attracting the Slavonians and Wallachians, these concessions repelled them. What they demanded was not an equality which incorporated and mingled them for ever with the Magyar race ; it was the equality and autonomy of each nationality."

In another passage of the same article, Desprez explains more distinctly his views of the motives which actuated those of the Slavonians of Hungary who fought on the side of Austria.

"The Slavonians have fought to prevent the formation of a united Hungary, to dissolve the old Hungarian unity ; in a word, to cut Hungary into four portions, according to the races. Is this clear? The Slavonians and the *Slavistes* have wished that a Magyaria, a Croatia, a Transylvania, and a Slovakia should be formed from the ruins of the Hungarian kingdom."

Here is something very different from a demand for an equality of political rights as Hungarian citizens.

Is it matter of surprise, is it matter of censure, that the Hungarian patriots could not at once bring themselves to consent that this idolized fatherland, which they hoped to raise into a free and powerful country, should be cut up into a number of petty states, which must, separately, be defenceless against the usurpations of Austria? And this, too, when the demand was made, not by the general voice of the people in whose name it was offered, but by ambitious demagogues in league with the Austrian government? Yet for this refusal the Hungarians have been assailed with equal violence by the reactionary and the ultra-radical writers in Europe. By the first, advisedly, and from sinister motives. By the last, ignorantly and sincerely. By many of these writers, the mere fact that an insurrection has taken place in a country is accepted as sufficient proof that there was just cause for it. Thus, when they hear of the Servian insurrection, by which a portion of Hungary was ravaged in the summer of 1848, they cry out against the pride and obstinacy of the Magyars, who, as they assume, refused to do justice to the claims of the Servians. Let us examine, then, the claims of the Servians, or, we should rather say, the claims made in their name, by the unprincipled and reckless men who worked upon the prejudices of an ignorant people.

The Servians or Rascians of Southern Hungary are not, as is commonly taken for granted by the accusers of the Magyars, the descendants of the original inhabitants of that country, striving to regain an independence of which their ancestors had been deprived by the Magyar conquerors. They are the descendants of emigrants from the Turkish provinces, who have taken refuge in Hungary in large bodies, at different periods.* A large migration of this sort took place in 1481, in the reign of King Matthias; another in 1690, when a body of this people, consisting of between thirty and forty thousand families, passed into Hungary, under their patriarch Csernowics, and were permitted to settle on some of the lands recently recovered from the Turks. The Rascians or Servians are chiefly of the Greek religion, and among this portion of them Russian emissaries have been at work for the last twenty years, inciting them to hatred of the Magyars.† A large body, chiefly composed of the lowest class of this people, assembled at the summons of a priest of the Greek Church, named Raiachich, in the month of May, at Carlowitz, in what they called a Servian national assembly. To this meeting thronged great numbers from the neighbouring principality of Servia, from Bosnia, and the other Turkish Slavonian provinces. Acting under the direction of Raiachich, this heterogeneous multitude declared the independence of the Servian nation, elected a Woiwode, and resolved that a large portion of Southern Hungary, including the whole of the Banat, the counties of Bács-Bodrog, Baranya, and Szerem, and a portion of the military frontier, should be formed into an independent Servian Woiwodina. The Servians did not compose the whole, or even the larger part, of the population of the region of which they proposed to possess themselves. Some statistics of the counties which they proposed to separate from Hungary will place the case in a clearer light than any other mode of argument.

* See Engel, *Geschichten des Ungarischen Reichs*, III. 381; V. 144, 149, 150. Schwartner, *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern*, II. 110. Schütte, *Ungarn und der Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, I. 205. Csaplowics, *Gemälde von Ungern*, I. 197.

† The reader will find much interesting information in regard to the intrigues of Russia in Hungary and Transylvania, in Mr. Paget's work on those countries. See *Hungary and Transylvania*, Vol. I. pp. 33-35, 127, 128, 478 (English edition of 1850).

Of the three counties of the Banat, — Torontál, Temes, and Krassó, — Torontál has a population of 349,836. Of these, 136,932 are of Slavonian race, of whom 124,447 are Servians. In Temes, of a population of 320,475, there are of Slavonian race 23,678, of whom only 14,260 are Servians. In the county of Krassó, out of 219,191 inhabitants, only 10,040 are of Slavonian race; of the Servian tribe there are none. In the county of Szerem, the Servians form the majority of the population. Of 106,924 inhabitants, 101,528 are Servians. The whole population of the county of Bács-Bodrog is 493,786. Of these, 200,470 are of Slavonian race, of whom 189,991 are Servians. The population of the county of Baranya is 251,552. There are in this county only 41,000 Servians; the rest of the inhabitants being chiefly Magyars and Germans, — 132,480 Magyars and 76,834 Germans.*

The insurgent Servians, whose principal force consisted in the trained troops of the military frontier, reinforced by large bodies of Slavonians from Bosnia and Servia, supplied with arms and ammunition from the Austrian arsenals, and led, even, in many instances, by Austrian officers, fell upon the defenceless inhabitants of the region of which they wished to possess themselves, burning and plundering, with every refinement of cruelty. This is the Servian insurrection, on account of which sympathy has been demanded for the oppressed Servians.

This cry of "Magyar oppression" has been so bruited through Europe, that it has come to pass current as an accepted fact by that large class of persons who believe a thing because they have heard it often. But when the grounds of the charges against the Magyars, which have gone the rounds of German and French newspapers and reviews, are examined, there will be found nothing, which — except in the view of an advocate of an exaggerated, and, in the present state of Europe, impossible application of the principle of "equality of rights for all nationalities" — could convict the Magyars of injustice. It will not appear that they desired to exercise any other ascendancy in Hungary than such as is possessed by some one race in every country where the population is

* Fényes, *Magyarország Leirása*, Pesten, 1847.

not perfectly homogeneous; — such, for example, as is exercised by the Anglo-Saxon race in the United States.

The German of Pennsylvania, the Frenchman of Louisiana, is not said to be deprived of his political rights because neither the German nor the French language is placed on an equality with the English, as the official language of the country.

The North American Reviewer has entirely misapprehended the questions at issue in Hungary.

“We see not,” he says, “what right the Magyars have to appropriate exclusively to themselves the name of *Hungarians*, though they are less than five millions in number, and first came into the country as intruders and conquerors in the tenth century, while they refuse to give this common appellation to the Sclavonians and Wallachians, numbering over seven millions, who were the aboriginal and rightful possessors of the soil.” — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 502.

The very object which the Hungarian patriots had in view was to make a Hungarian citizen of every inhabitant of the country. It was to prevent the accomplishment of this object that the Austrian government employed its agents to sow dissension in the various parts of the country. It was to further this object, — the making Hungary a firm, united state, capable of defying both the power and the arts of Austria, — that such efforts were made to promote the cultivation and diffusion of the Hungarian language, and to effect its establishment as the official language of the country.

There is no subject in regard to which the Hungarians have suffered greater misrepresentation than this question of language. The North American Reviewer has accepted and transferred to his own pages the most injurious of the charges which have been brought against them. Yet, in the work of De Gerando, which he took as the theme of his article, he might have found accurate details upon this subject, and the confutation of these very charges. De Gerando speaks often and feelingly of the cruel calumnies which were put forth on this subject by a portion of the German press.*

* Pulszky, a Hungarian noble of Slavonic descent, wrote a very able pamphlet on this subject, entitled *Die Sprachfrage in Ungarn*, in which he showed the injustice of the charges which were brought against the Magyars.

"The German press," he says, "took upon itself the office of supplying with information those in foreign countries, who took an interest in this question. It did so in the same spirit of impartiality which had characterized the accounts of the debates in the diet. 'The oppression of the Slavonians' served these writers as a new theme for their attacks on the liberal party. They published a number of incredible stories, and converted into an odious tyranny what was only the legitimate exercise of a political supremacy. They had declared that the emperor, in his liberal and paternal attempts in favor of the people, had been checked by the feudal pretensions of the aristocracy. They now affirmed further, that, the diet wishing to impose the Hungarian language by violence upon all the inhabitants, the sovereign, from a sense of justice, had found himself constrained to take the part of the oppressed. The Hungarians have complained of these calumnies; but they have, perhaps, been of service, by forcing them to watch over themselves, and to banish from their thoughts every thing which could resemble oppression. When, in fact, their opponents were called upon to make an exposition of their grievances, they could only cite, in a large book which they wrote on the occasion, a few isolated facts which had already been condemned by a general censure. For never has the diet, never has the Hungarian nation, manifested exaggerated pretensions." — *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 353, 354.

The vindication of their nationality was not the only object which the Hungarians had in view in establishing the national language as the language of public affairs, and in encouraging its cultivation. There is another very important view of the subject. We will present this view in the words of De Gerando.

"In restoring priority to their language, the Hungarians were not merely fortifying the independence of Hungary. It was not merely a question of recovering a lost position, but also of effecting a democratic revolution. The Latin language might indeed suffice for the country as long as the nobility alone were counted in the state. But it must necessarily give place to a popular idiom, when political rights were no longer to be confined to a small number." — *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 333, 334.

Which of the languages spoken in Hungary had a claim, then, to occupy this place? The language of the people who had given their name to the country, who had framed its institutions, who were, moreover, the most numerous race speaking one language,*—the

* There are not less than seventeen different languages and dialects spoken in Hungary.

language which, for the very reason that it was that of the principal race, and regarded as the national tongue, is more diffused than any other? * Or should one of the Slavonic dialects be selected, each confined to its own locality and spoken by a comparatively small number of people? If all existing claims of precedence were set aside, how should the question of priority of language be decided? The question lay, in fact, not between the Magyar language and any dialect of the Slavonic, not between the Magyar and the Wallachian, but between the Magyar and the German, the national language and the language of the foreign prince. The German language was, therefore, in Hungary, the symbol of subjection; the Magyar, that of independence.

It has been asserted that the Slavonians of Hungary, on this question, held the same position in regard to the Magyars, that these held to the Austrian government. This assertion was made by Count Leo de Thun, a Bohemian writer, who was one of the first that attempted to excite the Slavonians of Hungary to organize an opposition to the establishment of the Hungarian as the official language of the country. De Gerando thus comments on this assertion:—

“‘The Slavonians,’ says Count de Thun, ‘in resisting the Hungarians, would be in the same position as the Hungarians resisting Austria.’ These two situations ought not to be confounded, for Hungary only resists when it has to repel oppression. Besides, the Hungarian law which distinguishes Hungary from Austria makes no distinction between Slavonian and Hungarian, and it is to this equality that the Slavonian has owed his political rights. The author does not perceive that he is aiding the Austrian influence, which he dreads, he says, for Bohemia, his own country, as well as for Hungary. Resistance, in this case, is equivalent to separation. Hungary ought to remain separate from Austria, under pain of seeing itself confounded with the other states of

* De Gerando states that the Hungarian language is more widely diffused in Hungary than the French language was in France fifty years ago. “In 1793,” he says, “French was only spoken in fifteen departments of the interior, and a fourth part of the population were at that time wholly ignorant of the national language.” “The Hungarian language,” he says, “though belonging to only about five millions of the inhabitants of Hungary, is familiar to a much greater number.” “At the great fairs of Hungary,” he afterwards adds, “I have heard the Slavonians of different dialects converse in Hungarian, in order to understand one another.” — *De l'Esprit Public*, pp. 323, 324.

the empire, and of losing its glorious initiative, its life even, — nothing less. The example of Galicia, where the imperial administration has waited eighty years before undertaking the most elementary work of civilization, even suffering the Russian government itself to go in advance of it, tells, plainly enough, what would become of Hungary, if it were ever abandoned to Austrian activity. It is because resistance has the meaning of separation that the Slavonic resistance, if it were organized, would not only be anti-Hungarian, but anti-Slavonic. In order that Hungary should preserve and develop its free institutions, which all its inhabitants enjoy, or will soon enjoy, without distinction of language, it is necessary that it should weigh in the Austrian monarchy with the weight of thirteen millions of men. It is necessary that the sovereign should have to do, not with seventeen different populations, but with thirteen millions of Hungarians. The contest between Austrian and Hungarian influence in Hungary, is that of absolutism and liberty. Whenever the emperor of Austria shall make a census of the population of the country, he will not find Slavonians there, except to find Austrians. To understand the importance of this fact, it is necessary to know that the German population, although less numerous, has much more weight than the Slavonic element, because it is more cultivated. It is the error of Slavomanic writers, foreign to Hungary, to believe that, if the Hungarians had lost their supremacy in this country, it would have been taken from them by the Slavonians. On the contrary, it would have been by the Germans. This is so true, that there where the Hungarian spirit has found antagonists, in Croatia, Austria already acts as absolute mistress." * — pp. 347, 348.

Let us now examine the statements made by the *North American Reviewer*, in regard to this question of language. The first statement made by him on this subject is the following: —

"In a country where there was so great a confusion of tongues, it was absolutely necessary that some one language should be chosen for a universal medium in matters of government and legislation. The Latin has long been adopted for this purpose, its use having come down from the Middle Ages, when it was the general medium of learning throughout Europe, and its preservation in Hungary so long after it was abandoned elsewhere being due to the rivalry of different nationalities, two or three of which have been offended by the selection of any living

* De Gerando's work was completed at Presburg, in November, 1847, and was published in 1848, before the war.

language. The Latin was neutral ground, on which the German, the Magyar, the Slavonian, and the Wallachian could meet without cause of offence." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 111.

Where, we would ask, was the necessity for such a compromise between the different nationalities, in regard to the language used in matters of government and legislation, if the Magyars, according to the Reviewer's repeated assertion, "held the whole political power of the country in their hands" (p. 83), — if "the affairs of the counties are regulated exclusively by *Magyar* nobles" (p. 88), — if "they *alone* compose the county assemblies, which send delegates to the general diet, which has the supreme legislative power of the kingdom" (p. 94)? Surely it was an extraordinary act of complaisance, on the part of these haughty oppressors, to forbear the use of their own language out of consideration for their subjects, who, after all, could be but little sensible of the favor, they having, as it would seem, no share in "matters of government and legislation," and, from the account given by the Reviewer of their condition, being very little likely to be much better acquainted with the Latin than with the Magyar. And, again, how came these "subject races," as the Reviewer is pleased to style them, — these "*patient and laborious Wallachians and Slavonians, who have tilled the ground for them [the Magyars] for centuries, hardly conscious how firmly the yoke of servitude rested on their necks*" (p. 87), — to be thus suddenly elevated to a condition of "rivalry" with their lords? On page 85, we are told that "submission and inferiority have been enforced upon them through so many generations, that they have become the *badges of their tribe, and it is only within a few years that the idea of resistance, or the possibility of asserting an equality of rights, has even occurred to them.*" On the same page we are told that

"The subject nations, both Wallachian and Slavonic, are a rude, uneducated people, who have never been able to acquire the languages of their masters, which are fundamentally different from their own; and this circumstance alone has raised an insuperable bar to intercourse between them."

Rather an inconvenient state of things certainly, people living together in the relation of masters and servants for nearly a thousand years, and all the while "an insu-

perable bar to intercourse between them"! Does the Reviewer intend to say that this bar was happily removed by the introduction of the Latin, and that this language has furnished a "neutral ground," on which this "rude and uneducated people" could meet their "lords"?

The Reviewer then speaks of the attempts made by Joseph the Second to introduce the German as the official language of Hungary, and the successful resistance offered to his encroachments. He then proceeds:—

"The Magyars had thus vindicated the respect due to their own vernacular tongue, but they were not willing to respect the language and the national feeling of others. By constantly pressing the Austrian government on this point ever since 1800, they had at last succeeded in causing the Latin to be supplanted by the Magyar language in the deliberations of the Diet, and in the acts of the government; this change was not consummated till 1844. The few Slavonians in the legislature were still allowed, as of necessity, to address the assembly in Latin, and the government officials sometimes spoke German, though they risked their popularity by so doing."—p. 112.

This statement that "the few Slavonians in the legislature"* were still allowed to use the Latin language,

* The diet of Croatia and Slavonia sent three deputies to the Hungarian diet, one of whom sat in the upper, and two in the lower house. The Ban of Croatia and the Bishop of Zágráb (in Croatia) had also seats in the upper house, or Chamber of Magnates. The free district of Turopolja (in Croatia), whose inhabitants were ennobled in 1225, likewise sent a deputy to the Hungarian diet. The number of nobles in Croatia is 32,000. Slavonia had not only a voice in the choice of the deputies elected by the provincial diet, but the three counties of Slavonia—Verőcze, Pozsega, and Szerem—also sent each two deputies to the Hungarian diet, these counties being on a perfect equality in that respect with the other Hungarian counties. "Thus," says Csaplovics (a Slavonian Hungarian), in his *Slavonien und Croatien*, "the Slavonian counties are doubly represented in the Hungarian diet; namely, on their own account, and also by the Croat-Slavonic deputies." The number of nobles in these counties is very small, in consequence of this part of the country having been long under the dominion of the Turks. After its recovery, it remained for some time under the government of the Vienna Council of War, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the Hungarian diet. These three counties were reestablished as Hungarian counties in the middle of the last century. Verőcze has a population of 135,624; nobles, 1,014. Szerem has a population of 106,924; nobles, 816. Pozsega has 73,129 inhabitants; nobles, 638. The nobles in these counties are so few in number, that offices were often bestowed upon non-nobles. (See Csaplovics.) These counties sent the same number of representatives to the Hungarian diet with the largest Hungarian counties; with Bihár, for example, which has a population of more than 490,000, and more than 30,000 nobles. In the diet of 1843–44, the diet of which the Reviewer here speaks, were deputies of Slavonic race, not only from Croa-

after the law had made the Magyar the language of that assembly, seems not altogether in keeping with the rest of the conduct ascribed to the Magyars. This indulgence, and, indeed, the very appearance of these Slavonians in the diet, argue, it would seem, a liberality hardly to have been expected from this "haughty and imperious race."

The next statement of the Reviewer is, however, well calculated to remove any such favorable impression.

"Having carried this point against the Imperialists, the Magyars attempted to impose their language upon the subject races, and to oblige them *to use it upon all occasions*.(!) The schoolmasters and the clergy in every province and every village, though it might be inhabited exclusively by Slavonians and Wallachians, were ordered to teach and to preach only in the Magyar tongue. This law created great irritation everywhere, but especially in Croatia." — p. 112.

If the Reviewer had stated accurately what laws were passed by the Hungarian diet to promote the diffusion of the national language, and had candidly considered their justice and expediency, he would have given his readers an opportunity of judging for themselves of the merits of this question. Accepting as literal facts all the statements which he lays before them on this subject, they could make but one decision. It was the object of the Hungarian legislature to promote by every just and reasonable means the diffusion of the national language throughout the country, that the people of Hungary might thus become, in time, a united and powerful nation. But it never attempted to proscribe the languages of the non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary, or to impose the Magyar upon them by violence.* From the time that the Magyar was made, in the place of the Latin, the official language of the country, it became the duty of the legislature to provide that all the inhabit-

tia and Slavonia, but from many counties of Hungary proper, and this not only from counties chiefly peopled by Slavonians, but in some cases even from those in which the Magyar population predominates. Those counties of Hungary proper in which a Slavonic population predominates were on precisely the same footing in regard to representation as the other Hungarian counties.

* De Gerando, *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 335, 345, 353, 354.

ants of the country should be furnished with the means of acquiring a knowledge of this language. It certainly was not inflicting an injury on the Wallach or the Slavonian of Hungary, to afford him an opportunity of learning the language, a knowledge of which enabled him to understand the proceedings of the legislature, and opened to him the career of public life. That the object which the national and liberal party in Hungary had in view was of great importance to the prosperity and freedom of the country, cannot be questioned. Among its most ardent promoters were found men of Slavonian race.

The statement, that the clergy were ordered to preach *only in the Magyar language*, even to Slavonians and Wallachs, has no other foundation than the passage of a law by the Hungarian diet, in 1840, ordaining that a knowledge of the Magyar should, for the future, be required in candidates for ordination to the clerical office. This was one of the means taken for the promotion and general diffusion of the national language. It was not, certainly, expected that any clergyman should preach in this language to a parish that did not understand it. A knowledge of the principal languages of the country was very important to a clergyman. It not unfrequently happened that the population of the same parish was composed of different races, and, in such cases, it was not unusual for the same clergyman to perform the religious services in the different languages alternately. The law requiring a knowledge of the Magyar language in candidates for ordination was enacted for Hungary proper only, and did not extend to Croatia.

De Gerando, in the work which the Reviewer claims as one of the chief sources of his information, when speaking of the calumnies against the Hungarians circulated by the German press, gives the following story as an example:—

“One of the least ridiculous of the tales put forth by the German press is the history of the pastor of Kementze. . . . The Augsburg Gazette (*Allgemeine Zeitung*), on the 17th of August, 1843, related the following story:—A Hungarian minister, M. Söresz, who was completely ignorant of the Slavonic language,

was placed over the Slavonian Protestant parish of Kementze, with orders to Magyarize the inhabitants. He made constant efforts to obtain the prescribed end, but, after twelve years of fruitless attempts, touched with the complaints of his parish, he began to make use of the Slavonian, which he had learned at Kementze. The superintendent of the district, having asked an account of his mission, M. Söresz replied that he had labored in vain to Magyarize the Slavonians, and had renounced the project, which, indeed, he regarded as an impiety. This reply caused the removal of M. Söresz. But the parish having threatened the superintendent that they would embrace Catholicism, if deprived of their minister, he was restored, and continues to live and to speak as a Slavonian.*

"This account, very circumstantial, as the reader may observe, bore the signature of the person who wrote it. No detail was wanting. The names of persons and places were cited, in such a manner that it seemed impossible to doubt the truth of the fact. Yet in all this recital there is not one word of truth. M. Söresz, informed of the publication of this fable, contradicted, in a very energetic declaration, made in his own name and that of his parish, what he called a *panslavistic calumny*. He discovered nine falsehoods in the relation which has just been read. To speak only of the principal ones, he declared that he was himself a Slavonian, although his name indicated a remote Magyar origin; that he had been sent to Kementze, not to Magyarize the inhabitants, but for the very reason that he was himself a Slavonian; that he had never spoken Magyar to his auditors, for this reason, among others, that this language was less familiar to him than his own; that he had never been reprimanded or removed by the superintendent, and that his parish had never manifested the intention of abjuring Protestantism. The story of Kementze was, I believe, translated into all languages, and followed by others of the same kind, which we spare our readers."† — *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 354–357.

The statement, that the Magyars endeavoured to impose their language on the other races, and "to oblige them

* "These details are the more extraordinary, inasmuch as there are at the very gates of Pest, in the heart of Hungary, villages which are inhabited conjointly by Magyars, Slavonians, and Germans, and in which the religious services are performed alternately in the three languages." — *Note by De Gerando*.

† "We must do the *Allgemeine Zeitung* the justice to say, that, on this occasion, it reprinted the refutation (Jan. 30th, 1844). This is a fact sufficiently rare to deserve notice. It may be remarked, in passing, that the day on which the *Allgemeine Zeitung* should write with independence would be the last on which it would be received in Austria, where it numbers two thirds of its subscribers." — *Note by De Gerando*.

to use it on all occasions," has no foundation in any act of the Hungarian diet. The Reviewer appears, however, to be quite serious in this assertion, for we find him afterwards enumerating among the claims of the Croats and other Slavonians, which the Magyars, according to him, could not bring themselves to grant, even after the war with Austria had begun, the permission to "*speak their own language*"!*

The unhappy dissensions which had existed in Croatia for many years previous to the events of 1848, had their origin chiefly in causes over which the Hungarians had no control. These causes were found in the agitation carried on by the emissaries of Russia, in the efforts of the propagandists of panslavism, and, above all, in the perfidious policy of the Austrian government, which fostered every latent germ of strife.

The Austrian government had, indeed, for a course of years, both by open, illegal proceedings, and underhand machinations, interfered with the rights and disturbed the peace of Croatia. The Hungarians had not encroached upon the liberties of their Croatian countrymen; they only desired that the union should be maintained, by which the welfare of both people was promoted. The feeling which the national party in Hungary entertained for their Croatian countrymen may be judged of by the following letter, addressed by the Committee of Order in the city of Pest to the Croats, in March, 1848, shortly after the consent of the king had been obtained to the demands of the Hungarian people.

"Croats! brothers! After suffering from an oppression of three centuries' duration, we stand, at last, on the threshold of independence and liberty. The victory we have won has been won for you as much as for ourselves. The watchword under which we have contended, and under which, if it be needful, we will still contend, is not nationality, but the holy name of independence, of freedom, comprising all nationalities and all interests. The cause is common, yours as well as ours. The enemy is common to us both; — the Austrian despotic bureaucracy. Against this we must unite, Magyar, Croat, Serb, German, Wallach, and every race that inhabits this land. Only thus can we win, only thus can we maintain, the independence, the liberties, of the country. Beloved countrymen! It is in the holy name of

* *North American Review*, Jan., 1850, p. 129.

the friendship which, through good and evil fortune, has bound us for eight hundred years, that we address you. The brother will hear the word of the brother. Croatians, by all you hold sacred, we conjure you, let there be no variance between us. Let us forget diversity of language, we who are one in the interests of common liberty. Let us not listen to those who incite us against each other, for they wish to use our disunion for our common weakening and oppression. Brothers, let us be united."*

The Austrian government, forced to yield to the demands of the Hungarians, had recourse to its usual system of policy. At the same time that the demand for an independent Hungarian ministry was granted, Jellachich was appointed to the office of Ban of Croatia, at the request of that portion of the inhabitants who desired the separation of that country from Hungary, and the erection of an independent Slavonic state. The views of this party, indeed, went very far beyond those which were expressed in the demand they made of the Austrian government. The Slavonic party in Austria and Hungary looked forward not so much to independence as to domination. They cherished schemes of completely revolutionizing the Austrian empire, and converting it from a German into a Slavonic empire. Having this view, they were very willing to see Hungary reduced to the condition of an integral part of this empire, in which they promised themselves their numbers would give them the predominance. Whether Jellachich was originally the deceiver or the deceived, whether he intended to make use of the Austrian government, as the Austrian government intended to make use of him, or whether he was, even at the time of his appointment, ready to sacrifice both the schemes of his party and the liberties of his country to his own personal ambition, it is not easy to determine. The Illyrian party in Croatia saw his conduct, at the time, in the former light, and gave in to what they supposed to be his plans, little dreaming that the result was to be, not only the demolition of their air-built castles, but the loss of that liberty which Croatia had before enjoyed, under the protection of the Hungarian constitution.

From this time, the leaders of the disunion party in

* Szilágyi, *A Magyar Forradalom Története*, Pest, 1850.

Croatia assumed the tone of loyal subjects of the emperor and king. They denounced the Hungarians as rebels, and declared their own watchword to be, "the integrity of the empire." From the time of the entrance of Jellachich upon his office of Ban, all free expression of opinion was prohibited in Croatia. Extraordinary tribunals were established, before which those who dared to oppose the separation of Croatia from Hungary were dragged, and summarily condemned. The Ban ordered that all those should be punished as seditious persons, who should be found informing the peasants that they owed the abolition of the *robot* or soccage dues to the Hungarian diet. The county magistrates were everywhere displaced, and their places filled by the creatures of Jellachich and Gaj. The Ban proceeded to raise recruits, and to levy, by his own authority, compulsory contributions, to enable him to carry on his preparations for a war against Hungary. The people were assured that all that he did was done by the authority of the emperor.

The Hungarian ministry in vain made every attempt to effect an accommodation. They repeatedly requested Jellachich to name the grievances of the Croatian people, promising every guarantee for the preservation of their nationality, and the fulfilment of every reasonable demand. The Palatine summoned him to take a place in the Council of State. He disregarded the summons, denied the authority of the Palatine, and declared the entire separation of Croatia from Hungary. The Palatine of Hungary and the Hungarian ministry then appointed (May 10) Hrabowszky Royal Commissary in Croatia and Slavonia, for the purpose of restoring order and of reëstablishing the authority of the law. This course was authorized by a royal rescript, addressed to the Palatine (May 6). Another royal rescript was (May 7) addressed to Jellachich, in which the king declared his determination to maintain the integrity of the Hungarian crown, and commanded the Ban to submit himself to the commands of the Palatine. The royal mandate was disregarded, and the commission of Hrabowszky remained without effect. Jellachich was summoned to appear before the royal presence, to give an account of his conduct. He neglected the summons, and publicly declared that he was acting in the interests of the

king, and was secure of the royal approbation. The king, by another edict (May 29), forbade the assembling of the diet of Croatia and Slavonia, which Jellachich had illegally summoned by his own authority. This mandate was slighted, like the former. Finally, by a royal decree issued on the 10th of June,* Jellachich was divested of his office of Ban, and of all his military offices.† In the mean time he had actively commenced his preparations for making war upon Hungary, still declaring that he was acting in the service of the emperor and king, and that his object was the preservation of the monarchy. Shortly after the issuing of the decree of the 10th of June, by which he was divested of his dignities, he presented himself at Innspruck, and was warmly received by the imperial family, as the faithful supporter of their cause. He returned to Croatia to continue his preparations for the invasion of Hungary, and was furnished, at first secretly, afterwards more openly, with supplies of arms and money from Vienna.‡ On the opening of the Hungarian diet on the

* We would correct an inadvertence in the article on "Hungary and Austria, in the May number of the Christian Examiner. On page 495, line 27, the reader is requested to substitute "June" for "the following month." These words originally referred to the month of June. The article was, on account of its too great length, retrenched in many parts before sending to the press. Some passages relating to occurrences in May were thus omitted, and, by an oversight, the words "the following month," in the ensuing sentence, were not altered to suit the change.

† The principles which guided the conduct of the Austrian government during this period are well described by Schlesinger, in his *Aus Ungarn*. "The policy of the cabinet of Vienna towards the Magyars, artfully cloaked by the proclamation declaring the Croatian agitator a traitor, and by the declarations of neutrality made by Latour, the Minister of War, in the diet at Vienna, now lies clear before the world. The principles which it followed may be stated in few words: — Ostensible friendship for the Magyars; secret support of the Slavonians in the South; official denial of all share in the Southern Slavonian insurrection; secret subsidies for Jellachich; pretended attempts at mediation, and, at the same time, active agitation to render all reconciliation impossible."

‡ "On the same day that Jellachich was commanded, by a letter from the king, to submit himself to the command of the Hungarian ministry and General Hrabowszky, Latour sent him 50,000 gulden for the payment of his troops, besides arms and ammunition. These supplies were continued through the whole month of August, and the materials of war were chiefly taken from the arsenals in Vienna and Wiener-Neustadt and the equipment stores in Stockerau. As early as the 13th of August, on the day on which the emperor returned to Vienna from Innspruck, Latour believed the preparations of Jellachich so far advanced, that he sent him the necessary means for passing the Drave, two complete pontoon bridges, which were carried through Vienna on more than a hundred wagons to the Gloggnitz railroad." — Schütte, *Ungarn und der Unabhängigkeitskrieg*.

5th of July, 1848, the Austrian government not being yet in a condition to lay aside disguise, the Palatine, Archduke Stephen, in the name of his Majesty, King Ferdinand the Fifth, called upon the diet to take instant measures for the defence of the country. He declared that his Majesty had heard with great grief and concern of the use which had been made of the royal name by the instigators to rebellion, and assured the Hungarian nation, that the king was resolved to maintain the constitution and the laws, and to guard sacredly the integrity of his Hungarian crown. On the 11th of July, Kossuth, the Minister of Finance, offered in the diet a motion for a levy of men, and a contribution of money for the defence of the country. In the speech which he delivered upon that occasion, he laid before the diet a statement of the relations of Hungary and Croatia. We offer our readers an extract from this portion of his speech, desiring them to bear in mind, that they are not reading an account drawn up for the defence of the Hungarians in foreign countries, but a statement made by a member of the Hungarian ministry to the diet of the nation.

"If the Hungarians had, by any unjust act of theirs, given cause for this rebellion in Croatia, I would call upon them, even now, to quiet this rebellion, not by arms, but by a compliance with the demands of justice. It is known to you, that, even at the time when the nation extended its rights only to the especially privileged, it made Croatia a sharer in every right. The nation has possessed no right, since the days of Árpád, in which Croatia, from the time of its connection with us, has not fully participated. (*Igaz! True!*) But Croatia has not only shared all our rights; it has also received, at our expense, peculiar privileges. We cannot, therefore, find in the past any ground to accuse ourselves, or to feel, if we are forced to take up arms to defend our country, that we ourselves have provoked this insurrection. There is no cause in the past. Did, then, the last diet, which created a new epoch in the life of the nation, make any change in the favorable relations of Croatia with Hungary? I answer, No; those rights which we won for ourselves, we won for them. The freedom which was granted to the people of Hungary was bestowed by the diet also on the people of Croatia; the indemnity which was guaranteed to the nobles of Hungary was extended, at the cost of Hungary, to those of Croatia, which was unable itself to defray this charge.

"In regard to their nationality, concerning which, though only

in consequence of misunderstanding and erroneous representations, they had formerly some anxiety, the last diet, with a view to appeasing this anxiety, decreed that the Croats had a perfect right, in conformity with their own statutes, to use their own language in their public affairs within the limits of their own country. Their municipal rights have not been retrenched, but, on the contrary, increased. Is there a more important right than that of regulating the mode of choice of the representatives who are called to make the laws, to secure freedom, to defend the country? The diet has said to them, Croatian brothers, decide for yourselves how you will elect your representatives. Thus the last diet has fully recognized the independence of Croatia in regard to the municipal sphere. The decrees of the late diet, then, offer no cause for this rebellion. Is it, then, found in the conduct of the ministry? We have taken a step, Gentlemen, for which we are responsible to you. If this step had produced any effect in quieting the disposition to rebellion, I should gladly have announced it to you. As it is, I come to you with the confession that we have gone beyond the letter of the law. But we have gone beyond it, because we believed it impossible not to accept the natural consequences of the law. Since the diet had recognized the right of the Croats to use their own language in their own internal affairs, the ministry believed itself justified in extending this recognition of their nationality to the governmental communications. It therefore resolved, that, in its correspondence with Croatia, a Croatian translation should be placed beside the Hungarian, and that decrees should be issued in this manner.

The Croats attach great importance to the power of the Ban. The last diet not only left the power of the Ban of Croatia entire, but secured to him an influence in the government of the whole kingdom, by passing a law in virtue of which he was admitted to a place in the State Council of the Palatine. The ministry, therefore, immediately summoned the Ban, — this Ban whom the power which fell under the scourge of truth and freedom imposed on us, as a curse, in the last moments of its existence, to try whether the demon of reaction might not, by his means, be conjured up, — the ministry summoned this Ban to take his place in the Council of State, in order to confer with the ministry as to the means of restoring tranquillity and order in Croatia. The ministry at the same time called upon him to present the demands of the Croats, declaring themselves ready to grant every just demand, if it came within their power; if not, they pledged themselves to lay a bill to this effect before the representatives of the nation, and to make its acceptance the condition of their continuance in office. The Ban did not appear; he obstinately rejected the summons, and, placing himself at the head

of the rebellious party in Croatia, openly proclaimed the separation of that country from the Hungarian crown.

"I do not deny that Croatia has special grievances which have not yet been redressed; but for these neither the nation nor the ministry is responsible. These grievances are an inheritance bequeathed by the former government. The nation has always made these griefs its own, and has attempted by every means to obtain their redress, as that of their own grievances. The desire to take instant measures for the redress of these grievances was, indeed, one of the motives which induced us to call upon Jellachich, as the Ban named by his Majesty, to enter into an understanding with the ministry; for the ministry considered itself not merely empowered, but bound, wherever the law had been violated, to reinstate it in its integrity. The Ban has, however, by his rebellion, cut off the ministry from all possibility of making known to the Croats its decisions in regard to the petition presented to his Majesty by the diet of the province in 1845. Yet the ministry, under these circumstances, neglected nothing which could conduce to the restoration of quiet in Croatia and the frontier districts. The last diet gave the frontier districts the right of representation. They obtained, therefore, a right which they had never possessed since the military organization of the frontier. The ministry has not only taken every measure which lay in its power for causing this to go into effect, but has left nothing untried by which it could hope to conciliate the population of the frontier. It has commissioned General Hrabowszky as Royal Commissary, and empowered him to give to the inhabitants of the frontier the property of the land, in the same manner as it has been bestowed on the urbarial tenants in Hungary proper. It empowered him to abolish the *robot* due to the state; it empowered him to permit the inhabitants of the frontier the exercise of various branches of trade and manufacture, from which they had been excluded; it empowered him to afford every facility for free migration. At the same time, the ministry summoned the people to choose, according to communities or districts, men who should lay before the ministry the wishes of the people, that, if any thing yet remained which could justly be accorded to them, the ministry might immediately grant it. These unfortunate, deluded people have answered with riot and insurrection, so that there has been no opportunity for carrying into effect the beneficial measures on which the ministry resolved weeks ago. In a word, we have neglected nothing consistent with the freedom and rights of the nation to effect a conciliation. There has not, therefore, been the slightest cause given, either by the ministry or the nation, for the Croatian rebellion.

"Truly it is a strange thing. When a nation, believing it has

too little freedom, takes up arms in order to obtain greater, it is a doubtful game; for such arms are double-edged. Yet this I can understand. But when a people says, — ‘Your freedom is too great for me; I do not want what you give me; I go to bow down under the old absolutism,’ — this is what I cannot understand.”

The bill for a levy of men and contribution of money for the defence of the country was passed by the diet. But the ministry did not cease their efforts to bring about a peaceful accommodation. These efforts were without success. Jellachich demanded, as the first condition of a suspension of his hostile preparations, the relinquishment, on the part of the Hungarians, of the concession obtained from the king in March, of a separate ministry for war and finance. The news received in the last of July, of the successes of Radetsky in Italy, having restored the confidence of the Austrian government, the disguise which had, for some weeks, been less carefully maintained, was now laid aside. Supplies were forwarded to Jellachich with scarcely the affectation of concealment. In the last week of August, the imperial troops, under the command of Hrabowszky, marched towards Zágráb, at the summons of Jellachich, and placed themselves under his standard. On the 31st of August, the troops of the Ban took possession of the free port of Fiume, in the name of the emperor and king of Croatia. On the same day an autograph letter was addressed to the Palatine of Hungary by the king, expressing his approbation of an accompanying memorial, drawn up by the Vienna ministry, in which it was declared that the concessions granted to the Hungarians in March were illegal, on the ground that they were inconsistent with the Pragmatic Sanction, and that the king had, consequently, exceeded his powers in granting them. On the 4th of September, Jellachich was reinstated in his office of Ban, and in all his dignities, civil and military. On the 9th of the same month, he passed the Drave, and began the invasion of Hungary at the head of the imperial forces. The war which ensued is the war which is treated of in the *North American Review* for January, 1850, in the article entitled “The War of Races in Hungary.”

The view which the writer in the *North American*

takes of this war, and by which he justifies the title which he has given to his article, is, that it was a contest between the Magyars and the other races inhabiting Hungary, from September, 1848, until April, 1849; that it first became a war between Hungary and Austria, after the publication of the Hungarian manifesto of April, 1849, declaring the expulsion of the house of Hapsburg from the throne; which manifesto was called forth, according to him, by the liberal provisions of the constitution of Ollmütz, proclaimed by the Emperor Francis Joseph, in March, 1849. Up to this period, he represents the Austrian government as favoring now one, now the other, of the contending parties, as appeared most serviceable to its interests at the time. These views are set forth in a sort of summary of the principal features of the war, with which the Reviewer opens his subject.

"Though the war in Hungary began as early as September, 1848, a declaration of independence was not adopted by the Hungarian diet till the middle of April, 1849. *In the intervening months*, though much blood was shed, and the contest was waged with great exasperation on both sides, it had the aspect of a civil war between different portions of the same empire, the weight of imperial authority being thrown alternately on either side, according as the vicissitudes of the conflict caused the one or the other party to adopt a position which was more favorable to the interests of the emperor. *Thus Jellachich and his army were at first denounced by the imperialists as rebels; and, after the Slavonic rebellion in Bohemia had been crushed by the bombardment of Prague, the Austrian Marshal Hrabowski, commenced a campaign against the favorers of that rebellion in Croatia and Slavonia also*, while the Hungarians, acting on the side of the imperialists, menaced the same countries with invasion from the north." — *N. A. Review*, January, 1850, pp. 79, 80.

There was no vacillation, or appearance of vacillation, on the part of the Austrian government, during the period of which the Reviewer speaks. From the time that the preparations for the invasion of Hungary were completed, absolute submission, the resignation of the concessions of March, the surrender of the independence of their country, were the only conditions on which Austria would offer peace to the Hungarians. The events which

the Reviewer cites as taking place between September, 1848, and April, 1849, and from which he infers the undecided conduct of Austria during that period, actually took place in the period which intervened between March, 1848, — when the Hungarians accomplished their peaceful revolution, — and August of the same year, the period during which the Austrian government was still obliged to temporize, and to disavow in public the measures which it directed in secret. The proclamation by which Jellachich was declared a rebel bears date the 10th of June, 1848. Hrabowszky was appointed Royal Commissary in Croatia and Slavonia, in consequence of the illegal and arbitrary proceedings of Jellachich, on the 10th of May, 1848. This commission was renewed and confirmed on the 10th of June, when Jellachich was deposed from his office. Hrabowszky resigned his troops to Jellachich in the last week of August, 1848.

“But the Austrian cabinet,” continues the Reviewer, “soon found that Jellachich was less to be dreaded than Kossuth, and that the Slavonians were disposed to be more loyal subjects than the Magyars. By a sudden shift of policy, therefore, the Croats were taken into favor, and their redoubtable Ban, at the head of his army, was commissioned by the emperor to put down the insurrection in Hungary.” — p. 80.

The appointment of Jellachich as Royal Commissary in Hungary, with full powers, civil and military, was made public on the 3d of October, 1848. Of the events enumerated by the Reviewer as occurring during the months which intervened between September, 1848, and April, 1849, this is the only one which comes within the specified period.

“Still,” proceeds the Reviewer, “the Hungarians did not declare their independence of Austria, till the young emperor proclaimed a new and very liberal constitution for all his subjects, of whatever race, language, or province, in March, 1849.” — p. 80.

The Hungarians have always asserted their independence of Austria. The attempts of the Austrian government to subvert that independence have been the cause of the struggle of three centuries, which they have maintained against their kings of the house of Hapsburg. The jealous watchfulness with which they guarded their

rights was lulled, for a brief period, by the subtle policy of Maria Theresa ; but when her son, Joseph the Second, attempted to govern Hungary as a province of the Austrian dominions, the nation rose, forced him to recede from his pretensions, and revoke his illegal edicts. On the accession to the throne of Leopold the Second, the brother of Joseph, in 1790, the Hungarians demanded and obtained from him the fullest acknowledgment of the independence of their country. The tenth article of the acts passed by the diet of 1790, and sanctioned by the king, is as follows :—

“ Hungary is a free and independent kingdom, in no way subordinate to any other people or kingdom, and is to be governed by its lawfully crowned king, not according to the customs of the other hereditary dominions, but according to its own laws, rights, and customs.”

When, after the peace of 1815, Francis the First, the successor of Leopold, attempted to govern Hungary “ according to the customs of the other hereditary dominions,” the attempt was vigorously and successfully repelled. He was forced to recognize the fact, that, though emperor in Austria, he was only the constitutional king of Hungary. In the spring of 1848, the Hungarians obtained the recognition, in the fullest terms, of the independence of their country, and secured, as they believed, not merely the verbal recognition, but the actual possession, of their constitutional rights, by the formation of an independent, responsible Hungarian ministry.

It was this independence, thus guaranteed, that the Hungarians were resolved, at every other sacrifice, to maintain ; it was this independence that the Austrian government was resolved, at whatever cost of perfidy and violence, to subvert. When the preparations for the invasion of Hungary were completed, and the intention of the Austrian government to reduce Hungary to the condition of a province of the empire was apparent, the deputation which was sent by the Hungarian diet to make a last appeal to the conscience of the king, while they declared their unshaken loyalty to his person, firmly asserted the independence of their country as regarded Austria, reminding him that Hungary was “ not a province conquered by force of arms, but a free country,

whose independence he had himself confirmed and ratified by his coronation oath."

In the protest issued by the Hungarian diet against the arrangement made in the imperial family, on the 2d of December, 1848, by which Ferdinand was removed from the throne, and the young prince, Francis Joseph, appointed in his place, the independence of Hungary is declared in the most express terms. The following is an extract from this protest:—

"Hungary, and the countries and districts annexed to it, are not, and never have been, parts of the Austrian dominions, but form an independent country, which possesses its own constitution, and can only be governed according to its own laws, framed with the consent of the people."

No declaration of independence can be more explicit than this, made by the diet on the 7th of December, 1848, three months before the publication of the constitution of Ollmütz.

In the Hungarian manifesto of April 14th, 1849, the independence of Hungary is asserted, not as a new claim, but as an existing fact. The object of this manifesto was to announce to the rest of Europe, and to the world, the expulsion of the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine from the throne of Hungary, and to declare the causes which had compelled the Hungarian nation to this act. These causes are declared to be the many acts of treason and perfidy committed by this house against the Hungarian nation; the stirring up of insurrection among the people, with a view to involve the country in the horrors of a civil war, in order the more easily to effect its subjugation; the attempt to dismember the kingdom; the attempt to destroy the independent political existence of the country by force of arms, and the calling in the forces of a foreign power to aid in the accomplishment of these objects.

The bond of connection which a common sovereign had formed between Hungary and Austria was broken by the abdication of Ferdinand, in December, 1848. Francis Joseph never became lawfully king of Hungary. The consent of the Hungarian diet was never asked to the arrangement by which he was appointed to the throne. Even if he had been the lawfully crowned

king of Hungary, he had no power to make the smallest change in the constitution without the consent of the diet, much less to abolish it altogether. The constitution of Ollmütz, therefore, as regarded Hungary, was a nullity. It was of importance only as proving the intention of Francis Joseph to destroy completely the independent existence of Hungary, in case he should succeed in establishing his dominion over that country by conquest. The Reviewer takes it for granted that the Hungarians were left in undisturbed possession of the concessions granted them in March, 1848. On the same page in which he tells of the promulgation of this constitution of Ollmütz, which incorporated Hungary with the Austrian empire, he talks about the independence of the Hungarians having been "*amply secured by the concessions of the emperor the year before, concessions which made the connection of Hungary with Austria merely nominal*"! He can find, therefore, no other motive for the war, on the part of the Hungarians, than the desire to enslave and oppress their countrymen of different race, while Austria, according to him, engages "in a crusade for the purpose of forcing a liberal constitution on feudal and aristocratic Hungary" (p. 121).*

As the account quoted above (*ante*, p. 304) of the character of the Hungarian war from September, 1848, to April, 1849, is the very first statement made in regard to it by the North American Reviewer, and immediately follows his announcement of his authorities, it will be supposed that here, at least, they will be found to sustain him. Let us consult upon this point De Langs-

* The constitution of Ollmütz was not more popular with Slavonians than with Magyars. The following account of its reception in Croatia is taken from the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for September, 1849: —

"Austria begins to feel the embarrassments of the charter of Ollmütz. We have already several times given our opinion of this charter. Instead of the individual crowns of Hungary, Bohemia, Croatia, Gallicia, &c., there is now only one crown, the imperial diadem of Austria, worn by a prince who is no longer the feudal sovereign of subjects independent of each other, but the chief of a great administration in which they are all melted, the first *employé* of a vast bureaucratic hierarchy which incloses them all in its meshes, without distinction of tongue or race. This is the present which was made to the Slavonians, so jealous of their origin, as soon as they had been driven from the diet of Kremsier. The present is not accepted without resistance. The national council of the Croatsians, which deliberates at Agram, has broken openly with the Ban Jellachich, who is imposing upon it by force the Austrian constitution."

dorff, one of the principal authorities of the writer of "The War of Races." In an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, dated October 15, 1848, De Langsdorff speaks expressly of the war then going on in Hungary, as a war between Austria and Hungary. He says:—

"The quarrel between the Croats and the Magyars has now become the war between Austria and Hungary, and the Ban of Croatia, named Lieutenant-General of the Emperor, commands, by this title, the Austrian troops which have marched from the Drave towards the Danube."

The following is the account given by De Langsdorff of the progress of events from March to September, 1848. We would request our readers to bear in mind that they are reading the words of one who has no intention of making a representation favorable to the Hungarians.

"The period whose principal events we recount may be thus divided:—1st. From the 16th of March, the date of the revolution, until the 5th of July, the date of the opening of the diet. The Austrian government, broken by blow after blow in its own capital, repelled in Italy, fugitive at Innspruck, drops the reins, and delivers itself up without resistance to all the demands of the Hungarians. 2d. In July and August, resistance is organized at Vienna; the opposition which the revolutionary measures of the Hungarian ministry meet is encouraged, or at least tolerated. The two governments yet observe appearances in words, but both see that a contest is inevitable; the contest is delayed until the first days of September. 3d. From this period, hostile resolutions are taken on both sides; manifestoes call to arms. In the first week of September, Jellachich takes the command of all the imperial troops assembled in the three counties of Croatia and Slavonia. The Austrian Marshal Hrabowszky, under whose command they were placed, resigns them to him without complaint or resistance."

When the reader of "The War of Races" has advanced about forty-five pages in that article, he will receive from the Reviewer himself a wholly different representation of the course of events from that given in the beginning of the article. On page 123, he will learn that the bombardment of Prague—which according to the first statement occurred at some time between September, 1848, and April, 1849—took place on the "15th of June." Following the course of the Reviewer's narration, it will

appear that Jellachich was proclaimed a traitor, and Hrabowszky commissioned to act in Croatia and Slavonia, at some time between the bombardment of Prague and a meeting which took place between Batthyányi and Jellachich "in July, 1848." The "sudden shift of policy" by which "the Croats were taken into favor, and their redoubtable Ban commissioned to put down the insurrection in Hungary" (p. 80), took place, according to this second account (p. 125), soon after this meeting between Batthyányi and Jellachich in July.

"A conference between Jellachich and Bathiany at Vienna, in July, 1848, only showed that the hostility of the two races was implacable. When they separated, the latter exclaimed, 'We shall meet again on the Drave,' the northern boundary of Croatia. 'No,' answered Jellachich, 'but on the Danube.' The Ban then proceeded to Innspruck, where he satisfied his royal master that his countrymen would gladly continue their allegiance to the house of Austria, if they should be allowed to retain their language, and to enjoy those rights which the emperor had promised to all his subjects. To contend against them, he said, was only to assist the Magyars; for if subdued, they must become subjects of Hungary, which country now retained only a nominal connection with the empire, &c. . . . These reasons appearing conclusive, the emperor did not hesitate *at once to change sides, to unite the imperial forces with those he had just before denounced as rebels, and to commission the Ban Jellachich himself, the chief rebel, to put down the insurrection in Hungary.*" — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. pp. 124, 125.

What insurrection the Ban could find in Hungary to put down, unless it was that of the Servians, or the one which he was himself engaged in fomenting, it would not be easy to show. The Reviewer himself has not intimated, that, up to this time, any insurrectionary act had been committed by the Hungarians, or that they had even made preparation to repel invasion. The measures taken by the diet for the defence of the country, which he proceeds to relate, were, according to his own account, made after the arrangement had been concluded by which the Ban was to invade Hungary with the imperial forces.

"This arrangement, however," proceeds the Reviewer, "was kept secret for a time, to await the result of negotiations with the Magyars." — p. 125.

In the article on "The Politics of Europe," the Reviewer offers another reason for this secrecy:—

"It is not surprising that the Austrian ministers should at last open their eyes to this state of things, and resolve upon a sudden change of measures; but, *with their usual tortuous policy, they kept this resolution secret as long as they could, in order to take the Magyars unawares.*" — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 505.

Leaving our readers the choice of motives for Austrian dissimulation which the Reviewer offers them, we proceed with his narration.

"But this haughty and imperious race," he continues, "waited for no compromise."

The Hungarian ministry, who had from the first used every effort to avert from their country the horrors of war, and to take from Austria all pretext for armed invasion, did not cease from their exertions, even after the designs of the Austrian government were no longer doubtful. The conference which Batthyányi had with Jellachich in July, at Vienna, took place more than a month after the interview between Jellachich and the emperor at Innsbruck (June 19th), and a fortnight after the diet had passed the measures for the defence of the country, which the Reviewer cites in proof that the Hungarians "waited for no compromise." In this conference Batthyányi requested Jellachich to name the demands of the Croats. The Ban refused to enter into any negotiations with the Hungarians until they relinquished the concessions made them by the king in the month of March, of a separate ministry for the departments of war and finance; he demanded that these departments should be once more placed under the control of the Austrian ministry. Batthyányi replied, that this was a question between Hungary and Austria, and once more desired Jellachich to name the desires of the Croatian people. The Ban, in his character of champion of the "unity of the Austrian empire," remained obstinate, and demanded the surrender of the independence of Hungary as the condition upon which he would agree to suspend his hostile preparations. The conference remained, of course, without result. Even after the Austrian government had declared itself openly by the retraction of the concessions

of March, and while Jellachich, in command of the imperial forces, was threatening instant invasion, the Hungarians made yet another attempt to avert the war, by a direct appeal to their king. Even when this had failed, and the invasion of the country had already begun, they did not desist from their efforts to effect an accommodation. They sent a deputation to lay their cause before the Austrian diet, in order to obtain the mediation of that body. We will give the account of the failure of this embassy in the words of a member of the Austrian diet, — Dr. Fuster, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Vienna.

“The 19th of September was a mournful day. Deputies from the noble Hungarian nation knocked at the doors of the Austrian diet and begged admission. A people desired to open their hearts to another people, to secure their mediation in order to avert inexpressible calamities. The servility of the Centre, the heartlessness and fanaticism of the Bohemians, drove them from the door, — yes, drove them even with insult. Löchner’s admirable, prophetic speech did not avail to defend the noble, unfortunate Magyars from the low scorn of the Bohemians, who on that day gave proof of a meanness such as no other people has ever displayed. Rieger spoke afterwards, in Kremsier, like a Jupiter Tonans against tyranny, but in September he himself behaved like a mean tyrant towards the Magyars. And the centralists, — the servile souls who have always the welfare of Austria in their mouths, — what regard did they show for the welfare of Austria, when they gave their vote for the exclusion of the Hungarian deputation?” *

All the attempts to effect a negotiation, which the Hungarians subsequently made, only proved to them that the sacrifice of the independence of their country was the only price at which they could hope to obtain peace; at this cost they could not purchase it.

We return to the Reviewer’s account of the events of July.

“But this haughty and imperious race waited for no compromise, and their spirits only rose as the number of their enemies increased. Their diet voted an extraordinary contribution of a hundred millions of florins, a levy of two hundred thousand men,

* *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wiener Revolution*, von Dr. Anton Fuster. Frankfort am Main. 1850.

and an issue of two hundred millions of paper money. It was also proposed to recall the Hungarian regiments that were serving under Radetsky in Lombardy; but Kossuth cried out, 'Beware what you do! They are Croats and Slavonians whom you wish to recall.' The old liberal party of the constitutional opposition in the diet, led by such men as Széchény and Deak, and even Bathiany, who was far more radical in his politics, protested against these headlong proceedings, and recommended delay and negotiation; but the danger was imminent, the excitement was intense, and, as usual in such cases, the fanatics and ultra-ists, headed by Kossuth and Szémeré, carried every thing their own way."

It was on the 11th of July, 1848,* that the Hungarian diet, on the motion of Kossuth, minister of finance, voted a levy of two hundred thousand men, — forty thousand of whom were to be raised immediately, and the rest in case of necessity, — for the defence of the country. They likewise voted a contribution of forty-two millions of florins for the equipment and maintenance of the troops. These measures were not, as the Reviewer supposes, an act of open defiance to the Austrian government. The schemes of that government were, indeed, no longer concealed from the Hungarian ministry. It was now known to them, that the dangers which threatened the country proceeded from that quarter. They did not, however, depart from a strictly legal course. The measures which were proposed by the ministry and adopted by the diet, on the 11th of July, were in accordance with the royal will, as expressed in the speech from the throne, delivered by the Palatine (the Archduke Stephen), in the name of the king, at the opening of the diet. At the time that Kossuth offered the motion for the levy of two hundred thousand men, and a grant of money for their support, he announced his intention of afterwards preparing a plan for raising a portion of the amount voted, either by loan or an issue of paper money; he laid his plan before the diet in August, and, on the 5th of that month, an issue of twelve and a half millions of paper money, against a deposit of five millions in specie, was decreed. The

* Szilágyi, *A' Magyar Forradalom Története*, 93. Schutte, *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, II. 68-80. Frey, *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, I. 87.

amount of the issue was increased to sixty-one millions, towards the end of August, when the invasion of the country was daily expected to take place.

The objections offered by Kossuth to the proposal for the recall of the Hungarian troops serving in Italy were made in his speech of the 20th of July, when the royal demand for recruits for the army in Italy was under debate in the diet. The reader will find the *North American Reviewer*, in "The Politics of Europe,"* referring to the proceedings in the diet on that day, — nine days after the passing of the measures for the defence of the country which he here supposes to have been the signal of a final rupture with Austria, — in proof of the conservative dispositions of the Hungarian ministry.

The measures adopted by the diet, on the 11th of July, for the defence of the country, which measures the Reviewer supposes to have been protested against by "the old liberal party," by Széchényi,† Deák, and Batthyányi, were passed, not only without opposition, but without discussion.‡ When Kossuth concluded his speech with a motion for a levy of troops for the defence of the country, and the necessary supplies for their equipment and support, Paul Nyáry rose, and, almost before the last words were pronounced, said, in a voice which resounded through the hall, "We give it." The whole house rose, with one unanimous *Megadjuk!* (We give it!) and, when the tempest of applause had subsided, the

* See *North American Review*, April, 1850, p. 499. The Reviewer there speaks of the debates in the diet, on the subject of recruits for the army in Italy, as taking place in May. The diet was not in session during the month of May. The last diet at Presburg was closed on the 11th of April. The next diet was opened at Pest on the 5th of July. The debates on the Italian question took place on the 20th of that month. In the *North American Reviewer's* last article on Hungary, the date of this debate is given, — 20th July, 1848. See *North American Review*, January, 1851, p. 233.

† M. Pulszky (formerly Secretary of State to Ferdinand the Fifth, king of Hungary), in his introduction to Schlesinger's "War in Hungary," says that Széchényi "acted throughout in accordance with his colleagues; as minister from March, 1848, until September of the same year, he was never opposed to Kossuth; it was even Széchényi, not Kossuth, who originated the proposition in the ministerial cabinet to issue Hungarian paper money." — Vol. I. p. 83.

‡ See Szilágyi, Schütte, Frey, &c. De Langsdorff, one of the Reviewer's chief authorities, speaks of these measures as having passed "by acclamation." See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Oct., 1848, p. 263.

President announced that the motion of Kossuth had been adopted unanimously.

"It was when defeated in debate on this occasion," continues the Reviewer, "that the noble Széchenyi, seeing that his influence was lost, and the fate of his country was sealed by the madness of its demagogues, made an attempt upon his own life."

Széchenyi's melancholy derangement, occasioned by his apprehensions for the fate of his country, did not overtake him until September, nearly two months after the passage of the measures of the 11th of July. He took a part in the debates during the month of August. He left Pesth, on account of the deranged state of his nerves, on the 5th of September, and his illness, in consequence of extreme distress of mind, rapidly increased, until it ended in derangement.*

"The magnates generally," continues the Reviewer, "abandoned the cause at this crisis; they would not fight against their countrymen, but neither could they lead them onwards to certain destruction. They retired to their estates, or left the country. Kossuth and the untitled nobles, assisted by the peasants of their race, alone provoked the contest; and never did a large body of men fight more gallantly in support of an unwise, unjust, and desperate undertaking.

"Their situation, indeed, was perilous in the extreme. *Early in September, 1848, Jellachich took the command of all the imperial troops in Croatia and Slavonia, the Austrian Marshal Hrabowsky quietly resigning his post to him, and prepared to cross the Drave and march upon Pesth.*" — p. 126.

On page 79, as we have seen, this month of September makes the commencement of the period during which the contest had the aspect of a civil war, "the weight of imperial authority being thrown alternately on either side."

* The account given by Széchenyi's physician, Dr. Balogh, of the progress of his illness, is extremely affecting. He was with great difficulty persuaded to leave Buda-Pesth by Dr. Balogh, who assured him that the only hope of recovery lay in an instant departure from the scenes of excitement around him. He left, attended by his physician, on the 5th of September. When he had gone a short distance from the city, he sprang from the carriage, declaring that he could not leave his post, but that he would return to die with his countrymen. He was taken back to the carriage almost by force. On his journey, his disease rapidly gained ground, fits of deep melancholy alternating with accesses of frantic despair, until his reason was completely overthrown. See *A Magyar Forradalom Férfiai* (*The Men of the Hungarian Revolution*), Szilágyitól. Pesten, 1850.

But here we find that, early in that month, the "arrangement" made at Innspruck was carried into effect, and that Jellachich then took the command of the imperial troops, and began the invasion of Hungary.

If the reader will now turn to the article on "The Politics of Europe," he will be presented with yet another view of affairs. The denunciation of Jellachich as a traitor, and the commission of Hrabowszky, which, in "The War of Races," are enumerated among the acts of the Austrian government that prove the vacillation of that government during the period which intervened between *September, 1848, and April, 1849*, are brought forward, in "The Politics of Europe," to prove that the Imperialists and the Magyars were firm allies during *the spring and summer of 1848*.

"The Imperialists and Magyars acted as firm and independent allies during the spring and summer of 1848, the latter having achieved a virtual independence. . . . Austria and the Magyars acted as allies in a reciprocity of services. Kossuth and his party sent 40,000 troops to assist the emperor in crushing his revolted subjects in Lombardy; Ferdinand, in return, denounced Jellachich and Raiachich, the Croatians and the Servians, as rebels when they attempted to shake off the Magyar yoke, and sent one of his field-m Marshals, Hrabowski, to command the Imperialist-Magyar force which attacked Carlowitz." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 502.

The sudden shift of policy, which on page 80 is represented as terminating, at some indefinite period between September, 1848, and April, 1849, the vacillation of the Austrian government (*ante*, p. 305) which (on page 125) is supposed to have preceded the vote of the diet (July 11, 1848) for the levy of two hundred thousand men for the defence of the country, — a measure instigated, as the Reviewer there says, by this increase in the number of their enemies (*ante*, p. 312), — is on page 505 asserted to have taken place in August.

"But in August the Austrian ministry began to see that they had committed a great mistake in allying the imperial cause with the Magyars rather than with the Slavonians," &c. "Arms and encouragement were secretly furnished to the Croatians and Servians, and a plan of conduct was probably arranged by the Ban Jellachich on his visit to the emperor at Innspruck in August." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. pp. 505, 506.

In his last article upon Hungary (January, 1851), the Reviewer brushes away, without ceremony, the several theories he has propounded in his preceding ones. The proclamation by which Jellachich was declared a traitor, — this proclamation which, as we have seen, was adduced in the opening of "The War of Races" in proof of the vacillating conduct of Austria between September, 1848, and April, 1849, — this proclamation which in "The Politics of Europe" (p. 502) formed the emperor's share of the "reciprocity of services" which took place between Austria and Hungary during the spring and summer of 1848, — was, according to the Reviewer's latest supposition, *never issued by Ferdinand at all*. This document is now discovered to be a forgery. The Reviewer has been converted to this belief by the following passage from Count Mailáth.

"The Magyar ministry tried in vain various means to bring the Ban into subjection. He was summoned to Buda-Pesth; he did not come. A royal commissioner, General Hrabowsky, was ordered into Croatia; but he was not disposed to enter the province. The Ban was called to Innsbruck to answer for his conduct; he obeyed, and soon convinced the emperor that he wished only the welfare of the monarchy and the dynasty. On his journey home, he learned from a newspaper that he was deposed; but Croatia continued to obey him, and soon a *royal ordinance appeared which reinstated him in his dignity and office*. This deposition of the Ban was one of the most enigmatical occurrences of the time. Of the numerous reports which were circulated in reference to it, the most probable one is, that the President of the Magyar ministry, who was for some time in Innsbruck, by some unknown means, obtained the emperor's signature to a blank sheet of paper, and then, without the emperor's knowledge, filled it out with the deposition of the Ban. This report was somewhat confirmed by the fact, that *not the slightest protest was made by the Hungarian ministry when the Ban continued in the execution of his office*; the Magyar ministry dreaded any thorough investigation of this matter." — Mailáth, as cited in the *N. A. Review*, January, 1851, pp. 221, 222.

Why, we would ask, was the Ban *reinstated* if he had never been deposed? The royal ordinance by which he was reinstated appeared on the 4th of September, when all the preparations for the attack upon Hungary were completed, and five days before the actual invasion of the country. In this second decree, the authenticity of

the first is explicitly recognized. The king thus expresses himself:—

"It affords peculiar satisfaction to my paternal heart, that I can retract that sentence which I was induced to pronounce, in my manifesto of the 10th of June last, in regard to an inquiry to be instituted against you, and in regard to your temporary removal from the dignity of Ban, and from all military offices, upon the ground of a supposition which finds the fullest refutation in your tried, loyal devotion." *

In regard to the "*fact*, that not the slightest protest was made by the Hungarian ministry when the Ban continued in the execution of his office," in which Count Mailáth finds confirmation of the "report" that Batthyányi was guilty of the forgery of the decree by which Jellachich was deposed, the Reviewer might himself have furnished the confutation of this argument. In the memorial, dated July 4th, presented by the Hungarian ministry to the Archduke Stephen, from which the Reviewer gives an extract on the next page of his Review to that on which he quotes Count Mailáth, is found the following passage:—

"We now come to the second point, which we commend to the special attention of his Royal Highness the Archduke John. It is this, that his Majesty can consider neither the deputies of the Agram Congregation, held on the 5th of June, nor the Baron Jellachich individually, as representatives of the Croatian nation. Not the former, inasmuch as his Majesty, our gracious sovereign, having declared the Agram Congregation of the 5th of June to be illegal, his Imperial Royal Highness cannot treat the deputies of that Congregation as the legal representatives of the Slavish states without compromising the royal and legal declaration. Not the latter, since his Majesty has suspended Baron Jellachich, on a charge of rebellion, from all military and civil functions and dignities. And on this point *we cannot suppress our great surprise, that, in the note of his Imperial-Royal Highness, the Baron Jellachich is still spoken of as the Ban, a fact we are unable to reconcile with the legal declaration of his Majesty our gracious sovereign.*" †

The Reviewer finds an additional proof of the spuriousness of the decree by which Jellachich was removed

* A translation of this document is to be found in the Appendix to Schlesinger's *War in Hungary*, p. 323.

† See Appendix to *The War in Hungary*, by Max Schlesinger, p. 318.

from his office, in what he calls a "gross misstatement of fact in the document itself." This "misstatement of fact" is found in the statement of the fact that Jellachich had been summoned to appear before the emperor, and had neglected to obey the summons. The Reviewer says, that

"Towards the close of it [the proclamation by which Jellachich was deposed] allusion is made to the fact that the emperor had summoned Jellachich to come before him and defend his conduct, which summons, *it is foolishly alleged*, he had refused to obey." "Now, *it is notorious* that he did appear before the emperor at Innsbruck, in June, as summoned, and *there* had an interview with the chiefs of the Magyar ministry, Bathiany, Széchény, Esterhazy, and others, which interview terminated with the celebrated mutual defiance :— 'We shall meet again on the Drave !' said Bathiany. 'No,' answered Jellachich, 'but on the Danube.' And he kept his word. This gross misstatement of fact in the instrument itself is alone enough to prove Count Mailath's statement, that the whole document was a forgery, or was obtained by surreptitious means."— *N. A. Review*, Jan., 1851, p. 221.

Jellachich certainly appeared at Innsbruck in June, but not until after the decree by which he was deprived of his office had been issued. This decree is dated the 10th of June. The interview which Jellachich had with the emperor at Innsbruck took place on the 19th of that month, as he himself states in the proclamation, dated at Innsbruck, which he addressed on the next day to the frontier regiments in the army in Italy. The date of this interview is given in two of the works to which the Reviewer refers as authorities in his last article.

The Reviewer himself does not appear to have been always so well assured of the time and circumstances of this "notorious" interview. Let the reader compare with the above account from the *North American Review* for January, 1851, the following from the *North American Review* for January, 1850 :—

"The emperor, who, in the middle of May, had secretly left his capital and taken refuge at Innsbruck, temporized at first ; but as the conduct of the Czechs at Prague grew more outrageous, he became more hostile to the Slavonian cause, and summoned the Ban to meet him in the Tyrol, and to give an account of his conduct. Jellachich *not only refused*, but attended the

Slavonian diet, which he had called at Agram, where he was formally elected Ban by that assembly, having hitherto held his office by imperial appointment. *The emperor then denounced him as a rebel, and ordered him to be deprived of all his offices and titles.* The Austrian Marshal Hrabowsky, with a considerable body of troops, was sent to enforce these commands by the invasion of Croatia and Slavonia. The haughty and war-like Magyars would make no terms with those whom they regarded as their revolted subjects, whom they had ruled with absolute dominion for eight centuries. A conference between Jellachich and Bathiany, *at Vienna, in July, 1848*, only showed that the hostility of the two races was implacable. When they separated, the latter exclaimed, 'We shall meet again on the Drave,' the northern boundary of Croatia. 'No,' answered Jellachich, 'but on the Danube.' The Ban *then proceeded to Innspruck*, where he satisfied his royal master," &c.* (See *ante*, p. 310.)

The North American Reviewer returned to the subject of Hungary in his article on "The Politics of Europe," because he had found, as he says, that "the prejudices of some persons are inveterate" (p. 494). He wrote the second article, of course, to maintain the charges brought against the Hungarians in the first. But we do not find him making any attempt to substantiate the main accusation, enforced by constant repetition, in "The War of Races," namely, that the Hungarians engaged in war for the purpose of maintaining *feudal institutions*. He begins that portion of his new article which relates to Hungary, by laboring very strenuously quite a different point; namely, that they did not wage war "for the establishment of a republic"; as if this were the question at issue. We regard this as a question of minor importance, and one that concerns only the Hungarians themselves. We have no idea that the American people will require, before giving their sympathies to a struggle for freedom, to be satisfied that it had for its object the founding of a government precisely on the model of their own. But since the Reviewer has thought it worth while to devote five or six pages to this subject, and since it has afforded him occasion for a very extraordinary insinuation in regard to the truth of statements contained in the "Brief Explanatory Report," published in New

* *N. A. Review*, January, 1850, pp. 124, 125.

York, by Governor Ujházy, we think it proper to offer a few remarks upon it.

The Hungarians fought for the maintenance of their liberties, and of their constitutional form of government. The war in which they were engaged was a war of defence. They left no honorable means untried to avert it, and, after its commencement, would willingly have accepted such terms of accommodation as did not sacrifice the independence of the country. If the consent of the diet had been asked to the abdication of Ferdinand and the accession of Francis Joseph, — if the young prince had abandoned the iniquitous scheme for the accomplishment of which he was placed upon the throne, the incorporation of Hungary with the Austrian empire, — if he had caused himself to be legally crowned, and had taken the oath to the constitution, — he would, without doubt, have been permitted to wear the crown of Hungary. This would, probably, have appeared to a majority of the intelligent part of the nation the wisest and safest course, while it would have been that most congenial to the feelings and prejudices of the great mass of the people. The conduct of the new emperor soon put an end to all hope of a restoration of tranquillity through a return of the Austrian government to the path of justice and legality, and after the promulgation (in March, 1849) of the constitution of Ollmütz, which annihilated the independent existence of Hungary, had proved the fixed purpose of the house of Hapsburg to persist in its usurpations, the diet passed a decree excluding for ever every member of that perjured and treason-stained house from the throne of Hungary. The choice of a ruler now devolved upon the people. The diet then existing wisely abstained from agitating, at this critical period, any question which could excite a division of parties in the nation. They appointed a temporary governor, leaving the question of the form of government to be thereafter adopted to the decision of the national assembly, when the restored tranquillity of the country should permit the consideration of this question.

There had existed in Hungary, even from the days of March, 1848, a party which desired complete separation from Austria and the abolition of the monarchy. This party was in a decided minority up to the time of

the abdication of Ferdinand and the illegal intrusion of Francis Joseph upon the throne. The entire contempt which was manifested in this proceeding for the compact by which the Hungarian crown had been secured to the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine, took from royalty the support which it had hitherto found in the loyal nature of the Hungarian people. For a time, indeed, they refused to recognize the abdication of their king, and fought in the name of the king of Hungary against the emperor of Austria. But this was too slender a fallacy for them to cling to it long. The entire release of Hungary from all foreign control, and the establishment of a government which should have no interests separate from those of the people, were ideas which were gradually ripening in the public mind. The following extract from the "Explanatory Report" of Governor Ujházy* will give a just idea of the state of political parties in the spring of 1849, at the time of the adoption of the resolution expelling the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine from the throne of Hungary:—

"As in all revolutions, so in ours, there were several parties. There were some who intended to wage this contest simply for the recovery of the constitution of 1848, who wished to keep open a way of retreat, so that they might, in case of an unsuccessful issue, fall back under the Austrian rule.

"Others, of whom I was one, wished to sacrifice their property and their blood for a grander, more worthy object, namely, for a separation from Austria and the founding of a republic.

"In pursuance of this ardent wish, there was formed in March, at first in the bosom of the diet, a Democratic Republican Club, which, holding public sessions and honoring me with the presidency, had for its object the hastening of the declaration of independence, and consultation upon all subjects of interest that might occur.

* Ladislaus Ujházy, Főispán, or Supreme Count of the county of Sáros, and afterwards Governor of Komárom, was one of the earliest members of the republican party in Hungary. An Austrian writer, who has published some volumes of sketches of the leading men in the Hungarian revolution, speaks of Ujházy as a "*revenant* from the days of Cromwell." This writer, whose sketches are, in general, certainly not too favorable, speaks with entire respect of Ujházy. "Ujházy," he says, "was, apart from his treasonable language, an estimable enemy. He never went in a mask, but always gave himself out for what he was,—a living relic of the Rakóczy time. His motto in the chamber of Magnates was,—'I am not flattered with a show of freedom.'" See Levitschnigg, *Kossuth und seine Bannerschaft*.

"The members of this society very soon composed a majority, both in the upper house and the house of representatives, so that the then existing government, the so-called Committee of National Defence, under the presidency of Louis Kossuth, felt itself incited to a declaration of independence.

"This resolution was solemnly announced in the cathedral of Debreczin, in the presence of a countless multitude. Kossuth then delivered an eloquent discourse, in which he so powerfully and vividly depicted the injustice, treachery, and perjury, for three centuries practised by Austria upon Hungary, that every hearer uttered curses against that tyrannical and deceitful house.

"On this occasion, Kossuth was appointed, by one universal, thundering acclamation, Governor of the country. This event occurred on the 14th of April. When, shortly after, the Governor having named his new ministry, its President, Bartholemew Szemere, brought forward, with distinguished energy and decision, his republican programme, there followed such a lively expression of applause as I had never before heard, and which sufficiently indicated how well he met the views of the National Assembly, and to what maturity, even at that time, those principles had attained.

"From this decisive epoch onward, the main care of the Hungarian government was to place the administration of the country in the hands of men of purely republican sentiments, who fully approved the declaration of independence." — *Brief Explanatory Report*, pp. 5, 6.

It is from the statements made in the above extract that the Reviewer dissents, and in terms which imply an imputation of intentional inaccuracy.

"In the 'Brief Explanatory Report,' recently published at New York, under the name of Governor Ujhazy, it is admitted (p. 5) that, up to the time when the Hungarians regained possession of their capital, Buda-Pesth, in the spring of 1849, 'the dispositions of the diet were made purely in the spirit of a constitutional resistance, and the struggle was, so to speak, carried on in the name of the dethroned Ferdinand, against the young usurper, Franz Joseph.' It is asserted, however, that there was a party formed among the members of the diet, in March, 1849, which had for its object 'a separation from Austria and the founding of a republic,' — two things which the writer seems to consider as one; for his language in the paragraphs immediately following clearly shows, — probably, as the [London] Examiner suggests in a similar case, from the mistranslation of a Hungarian word, as Governor Ujhazy is ignorant of our language, — that he thought the Declaration of *Independence* was the same thing with the establish-

ment of a *Republic*. He says, for instance, 'From this decisive epoch onward, the main care of the Hungarian government was to place the administration of the country in the hands of men of purely republican sentiments, *who fully approved the Declaration of Independence*,' in which *the name of republic is not once mentioned!* We hope the *English* writer of this pamphlet made no deliberate attempt to obtain an *apparent* sanction of a statement which the Governor's regard for veracity would not allow him to make. But there is a seeming tergiversation in this passage which we are sorry to notice." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 498.

Is the editor of the *North American Review* ignorant that, in the *American Declaration of Independence*, the name of *republic* is not once mentioned?

In support of his extraordinary insinuations in regard to the veracity of the statements contained in the "Explanatory Report" of Governor Ujházy, the Reviewer brings forward a statement in regard to the position of parties in Hungary in 1848, purporting to be drawn from a work by Frey, entitled *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, which was published in Mannheim in 1849. The Reviewer thus introduces Frey to his readers:—

"The position of parties in the Hungarian diet is best explained by Mr. Arthur Frey, in his work published in London, in August, 1849, entitled 'Louis Kossuth and the Recent History of Hungary.' We have not seen this book, but borrow some extracts from it from the *London Athenæum*, which says, 'The spirit of the work is more than republican; it breathes the hottest aspirations of a party that worship revolution as something like a divine process.' Its authority, therefore, will not be disputed by the sympathizers with Kossuth and his party, especially as we are told that the book was drawn up 'from reports of the Pesth National Assembly,' or Hungarian Diet, with the assistance of Hungarian writers.* Mr. Frey says:—

"The National Assembly consisted of three parties;—1. A section of the aristocracy (Magnates), liberal on the whole, but firmly attached to the Austrian connection; 2. A middle party, *including the new ministry*, whose watchword was the entire independence of a free Hungary, if possible under an Austrian

* [Frey says that his work is compiled with the assistance of Hungarian and *Austrian* writers, and it is thus quoted in the *Athenæum*. The part which Austrian writers have had in the work is apparent. Frey's work is valuable for the documents and reports of the debates in the diet which it contains.]

king, if not, under some other sovereign, or form of sovereignty ;
3. An extreme radical or revolutionary party, represented by some thirty members.' ”

The passage which is here brought forward to controvert the statements made in Ujházy's "Report" in regard to the position of parties in Hungary in the spring of 1849, after the expulsion of the house of Hapsburg had been decreed, relates to the position of parties in the Hungarian diet in the summer of 1848, — before the concessions of March had been arbitrarily retracted by the king ; before the imperial forces had invaded the country ; before Francis Joseph had usurped the Hungarian crown ; before the octroyed constitution of Ollmütz had decreed the incorporation of Hungary with the Austrian empire.

This passage, moreover, which the Reviewer recommends to his readers on the strength of Frey's "more than republican" principles, is not an extract from the work of Frey, but from the review of the first volume of his work in the London Athenæum. It is a summary of the deductions formed from it, by the writer of that review, in regard to the position of parties in the Hungarian diet in the summer of 1848. It is introduced with "we are told," but does not purport to be an extract, not being distinguished by difference of type or mark of quotation. The writer in the Athenæum makes a number of extracts from the work of Frey, but they are all distinguished in one or the other of these ways from the rest of the article. So far as regards the particular points which the Reviewer designs to enforce, the passage in question is not the expression of the opinions of Frey. The reference to "Kossuth and his party," in the remarks with which the North American Reviewer introduces the extract, and the Italics with which he distinguishes the words "*including the new ministry*," show to what portion of the passage he wishes to direct the attention of his readers, and what inferences he intends shall be drawn from it. It will be observed, that, in his zeal to prevent Kossuth and his party from being mistaken for republicans, he forgets that this party, "ever since it was organized, has been endeavouring to effect a complete separation from Austria," with a view to the "preservation of feudal

privileges,"* and now indorses, and especially recommends to his readers, a statement that this party desired the independence of a *free* Hungary, "*if possible* under an *Austrian king*." This opinion, however correct, is not that of the "more than republican" Frey.† It is not apparent what bearing the opinions of that writer, or of any other person, in regard to the state of parties in Hungary in the summer of 1848, can have upon the accuracy of Governor Ujházy's statement in regard to the republican sentiments of the men in whose hands the administration of the country was placed in the spring of 1849. But since the Reviewer has thought proper to appeal to Frey's testimony on this point, in support of his charge of "tergiversation," we will lay before our readers that writer's views of the politics of the different members of the ministry in July, 1848. Frey has just been speaking of the debates which took place on the 20th of that month, fifteen days after the opening of the diet, on the subject of granting recruits for the imperial army in Italy.

"The reader has now before him the three most important speeches, which were made in the house of representatives at Pest, in regard to the Italian question, and which, at the same time, characterize the different parties of which the diet consisted. We count now three parties, and the reader will, after he has perused these three speeches, acknowledge the correctness of this view. For, as we perceive from the different speeches of Kossuth and Eötvös, the ministerial party was itself divided into two fractions; into the Batthyányi fraction, to which Eötvös, Déák, Klauzál, Széchényi, Meszáros, belonged, and into the Kossuth fraction, to which the single minister Szemere belonged. The first section had its basis chiefly in the class of magnates, and in the party of those who were attached to the emperor, who preferred to unite themselves with the conciliatory and unionist policy of Batthyányi, rather than with the violent, revolutionary policy of Kossuth."* — *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, I. 188.

But the special inference which the North American Reviewer plainly intends shall be drawn from the pas-

* *North American Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 111.

† The writer in the *Athenæum* makes it perfectly clear what are Frey's views of the character of Kossuth; he speaks of "*the thorough-going, revolutionary character*" which Frey "*loves to assign to his hero*." — *London Athenæum*, August 25, 1849, p. 855.

‡ We give this extract only as illustrating the views of Frey.

sage which he offers in Frey's name is, that, in case the independence of a free Hungary should prove not to be possible under an Austrian king, the Hungarians still excluded the idea of a republic, and could turn only to "*some other sovereign or form of sovereignty.*" This opinion is certainly not that of Frey. We will now place before our readers that writer's view of the principles which actuated the Hungarian government in the spring of 1849, the period referred to by Ujházy. Frey has just related the unanimous acceptance, by both houses, of the resolution expelling the house of Hapsburg from the throne of Hungary.

"The Hungarian struggle," he proceeds, "now began to assume that import which the *party of the republicans, Kossuth at their head*, the Poles and the many foreigners in the Hungarian army, had been striving to give it. . . . Kossuth had only waited for the favorable moment; he had left the house of Hapsburg time enough to extinguish, by their conduct, the last spark of attachment in the hearts of the people. Now, when the lips of every Magyar had only curses for the hitherto reigning family, Kossuth tore away the veil of constitutionality, with which he had hitherto covered his republican plans; now he showed them boldly; now he spoke it out in thundering tones, that only under a republican form of government could Hungary be free and happy; and the nation, which, perhaps, two months before, would have shuddered at the idea, now shouted forth its joyful and triumphant approbation." — *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, III. 13, 14.

We can offer more conclusive evidence than that of Frey, in regard to the political principles of the men in whose hands the government of Hungary was placed in the spring of 1849. The following is an extract from the speech in which Szemere, the head of the ministry appointed by Kossuth, after the adoption of the resolution of the 14th of April, 1849, explained to the diet the principles which were to direct his conduct and that of his colleagues.

"The ministry comes forward with no long programme. Three points, however, must be named. First, the ministry acknowledges itself to be a revolutionary government. It will not, therefore, shrink from any means conducive to the rescue of the country. With the return of peace it will cease to be a revolutionary government; extraordinary measures can be justified

only by extreme necessity. Secondly, the ministry declares itself to have a republican tendency. The enemy of monarchy, it is, in like manner, the enemy of every republic which preaches that 'property is robbery.' It wishes — God permitting — a republic which shall bless rather than shine. Thirdly, the ministry declares itself to have a democratic tendency. It adopts the principle of the sovereignty of the people in all, — yes, in all its consequences." *

One of the principal witnesses brought forward by the North American Reviewer is M. Paul de Bourgoing, *ancien Ministre de France en Russie et en Allemagne*. His evidence is appealed to in the article on "The Politics of Europe," and in the article upon Hungary in the North American Review for January, 1851. The most important extracts given from this writer relate to the affairs of Transylvania. The long extract given on this subject in "The Politics of Europe" is deserving of comment, inasmuch as it contains a quotation from a speech of Wesselényi, so modified, and introduced in such a connection, that this venerable patriot is made to appear the accuser of his countrymen. Before giving this extract, we will offer a few remarks on the political institutions of Transylvania, as they existed before the union with Hungary, and the change which this union introduced.

The institutions of Transylvania differed essentially from those of Hungary. In the latter country, no political distinctions existed founded on difference of race; but one nationality was recognized, — the Hungarian nationality. In Transylvania, on the contrary, three distinct nationalities were recognized, the Magyar, the Saxon, and the Székler. The Magyar, Székler, and Saxon deputies sat in the Transylvanian diet as representatives of their respective nations.† The other races found in Transylvania, the Wallachs, Armenians, &c., had, as nationalities, no political rights. The nobles of these races possessed the right of voting, and were eligible to the

* Levitschnigg, *Kossuth und seine Bannerschaft*, Pesth, 1850.

† "There are in Hungary many nations, but they are regarded as melted into one, — the Hungarian nation. Slavonian and German magnates and deputies sit in the diet, but they sit there as Hungarians. In Transylvania each nation has its territory which the law assigns it; each nation appears on its own account at the diet, which represents what has been called the Transylvanian trinity." — De Gerando, *La Transylvanie*, p. 51.

diet,* but they sat there as Magyars. Members of these races could likewise appear in the diet as deputies from the free cities; but they did not represent their nation. By the union with Hungary, which was effected in the summer of 1848, all these distinctions were abolished, and the benefits of the Hungarian constitution, which conferred equal rights on all the inhabitants of the country, were extended to Transylvania. The law passed by the diet of Hungary in March, and sanctioned by the king in April, 1848, which made the right of suffrage nearly universal, from the period of the union, had force in Transylvania. Deputies from that country, Saxons and Wallachs, as well as Magyars and Széklers, sat in the Hungarian diet which assembled at Pest in July, 1848.

The same means were used to stir up sedition and insurrection in Transylvania which had been put in practice in Croatia, and among the Servians of Southern Hungary. Austrian and Russian emissaries worked upon the prejudices and excited the ambitious hopes of the ignorant Wallachs. They were assured that the freedom and right to possess land which had recently been bestowed upon them were gifts from the emperor, and that it was the design of the Hungarians to reduce them to servitude. They were reminded that, if Transylvania were once more separated from Hungary, the Wallachs, as the "fourth nation" in Transylvania, would, being the most numerous race, have the control of the country. To these incitements to rebellion was added the influence of the Wallachs from Bucharest, who held forth yet grander views of an independent Rumania, to be formed by the union of all the territory inhabited by the Wallach or Rumanian race.

It is in speaking of the causes which led to the rebellion of the Wallachs, that M. de Bourgoing introduces the passages from the speech of Wesselényi to which we have referred.

"The Wallachians," says M. de Bourgoing, "who are more properly called the *Roumani*, were the last to take up arms; they did not determine upon this step till about the end of October; the Hungarians, they say, have only to thank Kossuth and his party for this hostility, which has been fatal to them, especially in

* De Gerando, *La Transylvanie*, p. 52.

Transylvania. They would have preferred to be on good terms with the Hungarians; and for this end, they asked only the recognition of their nationality, and the freedom that had been promised without distinction in the Hungarian constitution to all the races inhabiting the kingdom. The moderate party among the Magyars were quite willing to assent to the just demands of a people who were the natural allies of their race. It was thus that Count Wesselényi, a blind old man, who sat in the diet at Pesth, remarked in the session of the 29th of May:— ‘The horizon of my country is darker than the night of my eyes; our only means of safety consist in holding out a fraternal hand to the Roumani, and proposing an intimate alliance with them; for, like them, we, too, are isolated in the vast ocean of nations; our interests, as well as theirs, require a close alliance between us. I ask you, therefore, to pass a law that the nationality of the Roumani shall be respected.’ Kossuth rejected the motion, declaring that he knew nothing either of a Roumanic or a Croatian people, and that he recognized only Hungarian citizens. All the nationalities were thus trodden under foot; and the most odious acts soon followed, and completed the exasperation of these races. It was thus that the union of Transylvania with Hungary was decreed without asking the consent of the Roumani, who form a great majority of the population of the former province; it was thus that ultra-Magyar commissioners were sent to different localities with orders to exterminate the men of capacity and education (meaning thereby the schoolmasters and the priests, without whose direction the rude Wallachian peasants could do no harm); it was thus that in the neighbourhood of the cities and villages, and even on the highways, gibbets were erected, and on the public edifices in every part of Transylvania these words were inscribed, in the Hungarian and Roumani language, — *Union or Death.*

“The Roumani, driven to extremities, assembled, in the month of May, 1848, at Balasfalva, to the number of sixty thousand, presided over by their bishops of the Greek Church. Images of Trajan and Aurelian, and standards bearing the letters S. P. Q. R., reminded this multitude of their ancestors. The assembly discussed this question with great order and decorum; the result of their deliberations was a solemn protest against any union of Transylvania with Hungary, without the consent of the Roumanic nation. The Hungarian ministry kept on, and had recourse to rigorous measures. Everywhere they forbade the formation of the Roumanic national guard, everywhere the *men of intelligence* were imprisoned, and some who had been thus named in derision were hanged. Then a second meeting, after the fashion of the former Moldo-Wallachian convocation was held at

Balásfalva. In May, they had only protested against the union with Hungary; but, in this second popular assembly, the Roumanian nation declared itself separated from this country, recognized the Austrian constitution, took up arms and made common cause with the imperial troops against the Hungarians. Whatever may be the result, the Magyars would do wrong to accuse the Roumani of rebelling against them; if they had pursued a different policy, they would probably have had all this numerous population on their side." — De Bourgoing, as cited in the *N. A. Review*, April, 1850, pp. 507-509.

The passages quoted from the speech of Wesselényi, taken in the connection in which they are given in the above extract, would seem to imply that he had censured the conduct of his countrymen towards the Wallachs, and had counselled a more equitable course. They would, therefore, appear to contain an indirect admission, on the part of one of the Hungarian patriots themselves, that their own errors had been the cause of the distracted state of the country. Such a piece of evidence must have great weight in the mind of every candid reader. The date, too, ascribed to the speech of Wesselényi, — the 29th of May, — and the rejection by the diet, at that early period, before serious disturbances had taken place in Transylvania, of conciliatory measures proposed by one of the most distinguished patriots in the country, would seem to point out the Magyars as aggressors.

The speech of Wesselényi, from which De Bourgoing quotes, was delivered in August,* nearly three months after the union with Hungary had been accepted by the diet of Transylvania. The disturbances fomented by Austrian emissaries and designing demagogues had already assumed a serious aspect. Wesselényi begins his speech with a sketch of the unhappy condition of the country. He uses the comparison attributed to him by De Bourgoing. "With the eyes of my spirit," he says, "I penetrate the cloud-covered future of my country. The night that lies upon it is darker than the night of my eyes." He considers the various means by which rescue from the dangers which threaten the country,

* Frey, *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*. Mannheim, 1849, — Levitschnigg, *Kossuth und seine Bannerschaft*. Pesth, 1850.

through the unhappy dissensions which distract it, may be sought. He declares that the only means to be employed is conciliation; but he is very far from reproaching his countrymen with having acted in a different spirit from that which he recommends. De Bourgoing extracts a passage from the beginning and another from the end of the speech, and from the manner in which he words the proposal made by Wesselényi, it would be inferred that the Hungarian patriot had desired his countrymen to recognize the distinct nationality of the Wallachs.

It will be observed that, in stating the demands of the Wallachs or Rumani, De Bourgoing says, that they asked "only the recognition of their nationality, and the freedom that had been promised without distinction to all the races inhabiting the kingdom." A reader not familiar with the questions at issue in Hungary might, finding these two demands thus classed together, and introduced with "only," infer that they were of equal justice, and that they were both refused by the Hungarian diet. The claim to be admitted to the freedom which the Hungarian constitution bestowed on all the inhabitants of Hungary, is one of manifest justice. From the period of the union of Transylvania with Hungary, the inhabitants of the former country had a right to an equal share in the privileges of the Hungarian constitution. Their claims in this respect were fully recognized. That any misapprehension on this subject could exist among the Wallachs is only to be accounted for by their extreme ignorance, which left them at the mercy of the emissaries of despotism and unprincipled agitators. The demand for the "recognition of nationality" is of quite another character. By the union with Hungary, the distinction of nationalities which had previously existed in Transylvania was abolished. The Hungarian constitution recognized only Hungarian citizens. All the inhabitants of the country, under this title, enjoyed equal rights, without reference to race. It is manifest that the demand for the recognition of the distinct nationality of one of the races inhabiting the country could not be granted, without a great and injurious change in the constitution. Such concessions as could be safely made were made by the Hungarian diet.

"There is one right," says Wesselényi, in the speech from which De Bourgoing quotes, "which, in a country inhabited by many nationalities, can only be possessed by one. The official language must be the language of the race which has given its name to the country, the language which the oath of the prince has confirmed as the diplomatic language. This right cannot be shared; for, to decide its partition, the sword must be thrown into the scale. Every other right must be possessed by all in common. We have hitherto acted righteously in this respect. We have divested ourselves of our own privileges, to bestow privileges upon those who were deprived of them. The privileged Hungarian legislature has made every right common to the German, the Slavonian, the Wallach. Not because this or that man is a Hungarian, but because he is a man and a citizen, does he enjoy these rights. But the people have been deceived; they have been made to believe that the benefits which have been conferred upon them have proceeded only from the hand of the emperor. We have bestowed all our exertions to raise the millions to the rank of citizens, but the millions have been estranged from us; we have but weakened ourselves. The intriguing seducers of the people have persuaded the Croats and Serbs, the Saxons and Wallachs, that we wish to encroach upon their language. Otherwise these populations have had no cause either for apprehension or complaint. The rights of the Saxons were based upon privileges; they were secured by no law, no constitution. The new system has founded the rights and privileges of all the populations upon the constitution. No former law secured their nationality to the Wallachs, and now no separate nationalities can receive constitutions."

He speaks of the real grievances from which the Wallachs had formerly suffered.

"It is true that the rod of arbitrary power was wielded over the Wallach; yet not because he was a Wallach; the condition of the Magyar peasant was not better. This appears clearly from the fact, that the Wallach noble was raised to the highest offices. There was also the persecution of those professing the old Greek faith, which was carried so far that many died without baptism, and lived in unconsecrated marriage.* This has ceased; for in regard to their religious faith they are now as free as the Hungarians."

* The reader will find an account of the oppression exercised by the Austrian government over the Wallachs of Transylvania, belonging to the old Greek Church, in Paget's *Hungary and Transylvania*, Vol. II. pp. 128, 129 (English edition, 1850).

The motion which Wesselényi proposed was, that the house should offer to the Wallachs or Rumani, and to all the nationalities, the assurance of its intention to protect them in the possession of all their rights and civil liberties, and that the Wallachs should be allowed the use, in official matters, of the Wallachian language together with the Hungarian. The motion was accepted by the diet.*

We cannot but be of opinion, that, apart from the use made of the name of Wesselényi, the account given by De Bourgoing of the origin of the insurrection in Transylvania contains inconsistencies which might arrest the attention even of a careless reader. For example, the motion of Wesselényi is said by De Bourgoing to have been made and rejected on the 29th of May. "*The most odious acts soon followed.*" Among these acts are recounted the union of Transylvania with Hungary without the consent of the Rumani, the sending commissioners with orders to exterminate the men of capacity, and so on. "The Roumani," our author continues, "*driven to extremities, assembled, in the month of May, to the number of sixty thousand,*" &c. It is, of course, to be understood, that the Rumani were "driven to extremities" by the "odious acts" which followed the rejection of Wesselényi's conciliatory proposal of the 29th of May. If, therefore, we suppose the meeting which was held at Balásfalva in May to have taken place on the very last day of that month, but one intermediate day is allowed for the accomplishment of the union, the erection of gibbets on the highways, the placing inscriptions upon the public edifices in every part of Transylvania, and the sending forth of commissioners for the extermination of the men of capacity. It is further to be observed, that the diet to which Wesselényi offered his conciliatory motion is, by M. de Bourgoing, stated to have been held at Pest. The first diet held at Pest was opened on the 5th of July. Nor is this all. The Hungarian diet was not in session during the month of May. It was, therefore, an impossibility that it should have heard and rejected the proposal of Wesselényi in

* Frey, *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte.* Mannheim, 1849.

that month. The meeting at Balásfalva was held on the 15th of May; consequently, fourteen days before the date assigned by De Bourgoing to the motion of Wes-selényi, the rejection of which was, according to that writer, the first of the series of unjust acts which caused the Wallachs to assemble in this meeting to protest against the union. We give an account of this meeting, from Schütte's *Ungarn*.

"The Wallachs, also, seemed, at first, not averse to the union. By the exertions of their popes and procurators, and some Hungarian patriots, a great popular meeting was called together at Balásfalva; and, on the 15th of May, twelve thousand horsemen appeared on the plains of Balásfalva,—perhaps the most remarkable assembly which Europe has seen. Wallachian procurators in their advocate's dress, protopopes with their high-pointed caps and long beards, Boyars in their Oriental costume, Hungarian jurates, Magnates in their fanciful dresses, and the Székely chiefs, harangued the stormy crowds from the different stages. The result of the day was, that the Wallachs were acknowledged as the fourth politically privileged nation; civil, religious, political emancipation, freedom of the press, &c., were assured to them, and they therefore declared themselves for the union." *

The Wallachs were, accordingly, represented at the next Transylvanian diet, by which the union with Hungary was decreed. The following account of the proceedings in this diet are taken from Szilágyi's History of the Hungarian Revolution. †

"The diet assembled on the 28th of May. The royal commissary was Baron Puchner, commander-in-chief of the army in Transylvania. The details of the second sitting, in which the union was proclaimed, are, on many accounts, worthy of being related.

"It was ten o'clock in the morning. Noise, movement, excitement everywhere, showed what an important day was in prospect. The throng collected in the street spoke of the expected opposition of the deputies from Hermanstadt. Many feared some dangerous outbreak. All the benches were taken early in the

* *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, von Dr. A. Schütte, I. 231.

† This is a Hungarian work published in Pest in 1850, during the administration of Haynau. It is anti-national in spirit, but is very valuable on account of the documents it contains in the original Hungarian, and also because it gives many details not to be found elsewhere.

morning, and a dense crowd filled the hall and the street without. The hall presented a striking spectacle. Plumes, banners, waved from the galleries. An expression of intense expectation sat on every face. On the right of the hall was erected a stage for ladies, but part of this too was occupied by men.

"On the left of the throne were the benches of the royal officers. Not one of the heroes of the diet of 1847 was to be seen here. In their place, a deputation from Pest, who represented the sympathizers in Hungary, occupied a corner. On the benches of the deputies at the right sat the popular men of Transylvania; opposite to the throne, the taxal and Saxon deputies. In the centre, a table surrounded by the regalists, and, finally, the seat of the president. At the doors stood members of the national guard, for the crowd outside pressed in. The walls were decorated with the arms of Hungary and with inscriptions,—'Long live the king, the Palatine, the Hungarian ministry,' &c. After ten o'clock, the members of the diet began to assemble. The hall received its old favorites with thundering *éljens*. When Wesselényi entered, it seemed as if the acclamations would never have an end. The same thing happened at the entrance of Lemény.

"The hall is full; there is not a place for another foot. The shout, *Eljen az unió!* Live the union! resounds from the street.

"The president opened the meeting. Baron Wesselényi then declared, in a short and pithy speech, that the only thing for Transylvania, under the present circumstances, was the union.

"Then Charles Szász rose, and asked a declaration from the President. Dominic Kemény calls upon those who have any objections to speak. All eyes turn on the Saxon deputies. There is silence as of the grave, and intense expectation. The Kronstadt deputy rises and speaks thus:—'In the name of my constituents, I give my vote for the union, with the maintenance of the integrity of the Pragmatic Sanction.'

"Amid tremendous acclamations, the Saxon deputies rose and bowed to the assembly, which was transported with joy. Dionysius Kemény spoke at length of the objects of the union, of the advantages which might be expected from it, and expressed his belief that it was the only remedy for the disturbed state of the people. In a part of his speech he referred to the Saxons and Wallachs. Upon that, Schmidt, the deputy from Hermanstadt, declared the groundlessness of all those calumnies which had been circulated concerning the Saxons. (Approbation.) 'It was reported among them, too, that here the life of a Saxon would not be safe. I did not believe it, and the best proof is, that here I am.' The people without called for Schmidt and Lemény, who went out to them. The Saxon deputy [Schmidt]

greeted the Magyar people in the name of the Saxon nation, and related what had just taken place in the hall. They brought a chair to Bishop Lemény, and the venerable old man, standing on it, spoke in a moving manner. He reciprocated with grateful greeting the respect paid to the Wallach nation in his person. He urged the assembled crowd to concord, to attachment to their king and country, and promised the same in the name of the Wallach nation. The people, with loud shouts of 'Long live the Wallachs!' 'Long live the Saxons!' led them back to the hall. After some more speeches, the president declared that the union had been accepted by general consent."—Szilágyi, *A' Magyar Forradalom Története*, 70, 71.

It was not without a feeling of surprise that we found the name of John Paget in the list of the witnesses against Hungary brought forward by the North American Reviewer. Mr. Paget is the author of a valuable work, entitled "Hungary and Transylvania," published about eleven years ago. His motive for writing, as explained in his preface, was the same with that which influenced M. de Gerando,—the desire to call the attention of his countrymen to an interesting people, whose institutions and character, in consequence of the circumstances of their position, were very little understood in foreign countries.

The Reviewer has given, in "The Politics of Europe," two sets of extracts from the work of Mr. Paget. The first consists of some anecdotes illustrative of the strong national feeling of the Magyars. National pride is, without doubt, a striking trait in the character of that people; and this feeling will, doubtless, in Hungary, as in other countries, especially among the uneducated classes, sometimes display itself in an unreasonable manner. But national pride is not in itself a reprehensible trait. When based upon worthy grounds, it affords the same security in regard to the conduct of a nation, which a high sense of personal character gives in the case of an individual.

"All the cruelties of a Haynau," says Schütte, "could not bring the Hungarians to make reprisals upon the numerous prisoners that were in their hands. Even in the midst of the rage of battle, this generous trait in the Magyar character displayed itself towards their wounded and fallen enemies."

"National feeling has no little influence on this feature of the

Magyar character, for everywhere this motive is in the background: — 'Thus acts the Magyar!' An Austrian officer died after the battle of Gödöllő in the arms of a Honvéd, and, in dying, gave into his hands the only thing of value he had with him, a watch, which he requested him to send to a lady in Vienna. The poor Honvéd answered nothing but *Magyar ember*, (I am a Magyar,) made his way through the outposts of the enemy, and delivered the watch into the charge of an Austrian officer. When it was suggested to Kossuth, that, in the worst event, he might make Austrian bank notes, as he had all the means for it in his power, and that he need only give them out in case Austria would not acknowledge the Hungarian notes, he rejected the proposal with a simple *Magyar ember*. We could bring forward a hundred such examples from the late war, and are of opinion that this noble, but sometimes overstrained, self-respect has not a little contributed to the downfall of Hungary; for, in a contest with brute force, generosity is often dangerous." — *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, l. 63, 64.

This innate self-respect, which deters from what is ungenerous or unworthy, is a trait in the Magyar character which cannot be overlooked, even by their opponents. "The Magyar people," says Desprez, "have preserved in their character a gravity and elevation which would have rendered vulgarity of sentiment or expression odious to them; Kossuth has never spoken to them any other language than that of poetry, honor, courage, national dignity."*

The second set of extracts from Mr. Paget's work consists of a number of detached passages, brought forward to support the Reviewer's assertions in regard to the harsh manner in which the feudal rights of the nobles were exercised.† It is to be observed, that, out of the six

* *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Déc., 1849.

† From some passages in "The War of Races," it would seem that the writer of that article supposed that the peasants of Magyar race enjoyed superior privileges to the rest of the peasantry. He says: —

"The Magyars who are not noble form the higher class of the peasantry; and, though not often rich, they have generally most of the necessities and even the comforts of life; as the feudal burdens on their lands are not excessive, and their tenant rights are often very valuable." — *North American Review*, January, 1850, p. 88.

The burdens of the Magyar peasant were not lighter, nor his tenant rights more valuable, than those of the peasants of the other races. The laws made no distinctions between the different races. (We use the past tense, because in March, 1848, the urbarial system was abolished, and the peasants by the act of the diet — composed of landed proprietors — were

passages selected by the Reviewer with this object, four relate, not to Hungary, but to Transylvania, where reform had made much less progress, and where the distinction between "sovereign nations" and "subject nations," which the Reviewer supposes to have existed in Hungary, really existed, prior to the union of the two countries, in 1848. Even in Transylvania, however, great improvements in the condition of the peasantry were effected during the ten years preceding the Hungarian war. This improvement was due to the Magyar magnates and nobles.*

"We do not believe," says De Gerando, "that there is found, in the history of political parties, one more worthy of interest and sympathy than that which the liberal nobility of Transylvania compose. This party sincerely desires reform; it has already realized some of the most important. And for whose benefit? For that of a suffering class whom long servitude has formed to hatred, and who may one day imitate the example of their neighbours in Galicia. Who prevents this nobility from repairing a past of which it is innocent, and from introducing justice into the legislation? The government, which ought to take in hand the cause of the oppressed. And yet is it not upon the nobles that the popular vengeance will fall, if the breaking of this yoke, which is maintained in spite of themselves, is delayed? When will the Austrian policy cease to paralyze the most noble efforts? Holy justice, how long shall this heavy hand weigh on a whole people!" — *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, p. 227.

Of the two extracts of this series which relate to Hungary, the first has reference to a law formerly existing, which gave the manorial lord the right of ordering the infliction of corporal punishment on his peasants, to the

made owners of the lands which they occupied.) If the Magyars are regarded as forming "the higher class of the peasantry," it is not to their greater wealth that they owe this distinction. The German peasants of Hungary have, in this respect, from their great industry and frugality, a decided superiority over all the other races. (See Fényes, *Magyarország Leirása*.) De Langsdorff, — one of the Reviewer's authorities, — in an article in which he treats of the condition of the Hungarian peasantry, dwells much upon the superior prosperity of those of the German race. "The burdens of the German peasant," he says, "are precisely those which are borne by all the peasants. If, then, there is not found among the other races that enviable comfort which the German villages display, it is to the vices, or, if you will, to the qualities of race, that it is to be attributed, not to the barbarous legislation." — *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Décembre, 1848.

* See De Gerando, *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 222 - 227.

amount of twenty-five blows. Mr. Paget speaks of this law as already repealed.

The other extract relating to the Hungarian peasantry refers to the *cassa domestica*, or the taxes raised for the expenses of the county, which were formerly borne by the peasants alone. The Reviewer has himself informed us in his article on "The War of Races," — when he designed to show the injustice of bestowing the land on the peasants without indemnification to the owners, — "that the aggregate of all these burdens does not amount to a fair rent for the value of the land" (p. 95). But whether this system was an oppressive one to the peasants, or not, it was numbered among past things before the breaking out of the war.

Mr. Paget expresses with frankness and decision his opinion of whatever appeared to him objectionable in the institutions of Hungary; but there is nothing in his work which will justify the inference that the rights of the nobles over the peasants were exorbitant, or harshly used. After giving an account of the laws which regulate the rights and obligations of the peasants, he adds: —

"I have entered thus at length into the laws affecting the Hungarian peasantry, especially those which regulate their intercourse with their lords, because I have been anxious to show that they are not, as strangers commonly suppose, serfs, nor their lords tyrants, with unlimited powers over their lives and fortunes.

"The rights of each are accurately defined, and a cheap and easy process exists for obtaining justice on either side. The rent paid by the peasant in labor and produce, instead of cash, is exceedingly small; and he is endowed with a right in the property inconsistent even with our notions of the landlord's just claims." — *Hungary and Transylvania*, Vol. I. p. 305.

It is to be remembered, in reading Mr. Paget's work, that it is more than twelve years since he was in Hungary, and that many reforms took place there subsequent to his visit, even before the changes which were effected in March, 1848.

The Reviewer begins his last article upon Hungary with about thirty pages of extracts, culled from various sources, leaving it to the discrimination of his readers to make such application of them as they will, or can. It is, of course, understood that all these passages contain

something which, if rightly interpreted, would prove to be very discreditable to the Hungarians, either as regards their earlier or more recent history; but many of them will, we believe, in this view, even with all the aid which the Italics of the Reviewer offer to the imagination, be found to baffle the penetration of the most acute reader. Many of them, indeed, — especially those taken from respectable authorities, — must be quite unintelligible, except to those readers who are familiar with the books from which they are taken, and whose memory can supply the context. With such readers, they will entirely fail of the effect intended. Having thus placed before his readers what he calls “a formidable array of authorities,” the Reviewer informs them that he has told the story of the war in Hungary over again, “merely using the language of a crowd of reputable and unimpeached witnesses, instead of” his “own.”

The first of these unimpeached witnesses is Lamartine, whom the North American Reviewer has elsewhere characterized as a “fantastic rhetorician, wholly devoid of practical talent” (see *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXIX. p. 282), who “established himself at the head of affairs by virtue of a theatrical manner and a few high-sounding speeches” (p. 283), and, finally, “our poor, phrase-making, gasconading friend Lamartine” (p. 284). With what conscience does the Reviewer bring forward the opinions of such a person as evidence on an important historical question? If the North American Reviewer does not believe that Lamartine (see *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXIX. p. 312) is capable of judging of the character of the French revolution, what reason has he to suppose that he is better qualified to pronounce on that of the Hungarians?

The next witness is Lord Brougham, who is summoned, possibly, to confirm the North American Reviewer's statements in regard to the “credit” due to the Austrian government for its zeal in the promotion of reform. Lord Brougham ascribes the measures of reform affecting the condition of the peasantry which were accomplished in Hungary between 1832 and 1836, or, as he says, “the new urbarium of 1835,” to an “edict” of “that eminent statesman, so long at the head of the

Austrian councils," — Prince Metternich! If this be correct, what becomes of the account given, after De Langsdorff, in "The War of Races" (p. 107), of the reforms passed by the Hungarian diet?

It is not, however, necessary to resort to any secondary authority to show that the "new urbarium" was passed by the votes of the Hungarian diet. We have before us the volume containing the acts of the Hungarian diet of 1832–36, published at Pressburg in Hungarian and Latin. Among these are the urbarial laws, and all the laws past for the improvement of the condition of the peasantry during that period, being Articles IV. to XIII. inclusive, of those acts.* These laws are signed by the king, and by the Hungarian Chancellor Reviczky. The king, in promulgating these laws, says that the lords prelates, barons, magnates, nobles, and other states and orders of the kingdom of Hungary, and the parts thereto annexed, have laid before his Majesty these articles, which have been concluded in the diet by their common votes and suffrages, praying that he would benignly deign to accept, approve, and confirm the same, &c.

One of the most important of the Reviewer's authorities, one which has furnished him with not less than a dozen of his citations, is a little pamphlet, published in London, under the name of Corvinus. It is a production of no value whatever, and not worth noticing. Such as it is, however, its testimony in regard to the objects of the Hungarian revolution is in direct contradiction to the assertions of the North American Reviewer. For example, in speaking of the diet of 1847–48, he says, —

"But a spirit came over that diet which no administrative reforms could satisfy, — a spirit totally at variance with the genius of the ancient constitution, — which established its ascendancy by abrogating that constitution, and sought to maintain it by sacrificing the monarchy. There can be no greater error than to suppose that the war of 1848–49 was a movement in defence of the time-honored institutions which had their roots in the laws of St. Stephen and Andreas the Second." — *Hungary, &c.*, by Corvinus, p. 9.

* See 183 $\frac{3}{4}$ dik Évi Országgyűlésen alkotott Törvény Czikkelyek. (*Articuli Comitiorum Anni 183 $\frac{3}{4}$ i.*) Po'sonyban.

How does this coincide with the statements in (pp. 120, 130, 135) the *North American Review* for January, 1850, that the Magyars engaged in a war for the support of their ancient feudal institutions?

We believe that the readers of the *North American* must be vividly impressed with the difficulty of obtaining available evidence against the Hungarians, when they find the Reviewer offering them the opinions of an anonymous correspondent of an unknown newspaper, quoted in an anonymous work.* The Reviewer is indebted, for this important contribution to the number of his authorities, to a work entitled *Thronfolge und der Pragmatische Sanction in Ungarn*, published in Pressburg in 1849. This work does not appear to be of a very original character, if we may judge from the two extracts given from it in the *North American Review*. One of these belongs to this nameless newspaper correspondent, the other is the property of M. Desprez, being taken from an article by that writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of the 15th of August, 1848 (pp. 620, 621). These articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* are an inexhaustible mine for the enemies of Hungary on both sides of the Atlantic. They, of course, furnish their contributions to the *North American Review* for January, 1851. Desprez thus does double duty there, appear-

* See the extract on pp. 232, 233, of the *North American Review* for January, 1851, beginning, "*A newspaper correspondent was right who,*" &c. This is not the only occasion on which the *North American Reviewer* has relied upon testimony of this nature. The statements of an "English officer," introduced on p. 132 of the *North American Review* for January, 1850, to substantiate the Reviewer's assertions in regard to the cruelties perpetrated by Bem's army in Transylvania, rest on the authority of the anonymous correspondent of a newspaper. Some passages from a letter, purporting to be from an "English officer," communicated to the *London Times*, are quoted in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for August, 1849 (p. 226), by De Langsdorff, who, however, names his authority. A portion of the extracts given from this letter by De Langsdorff are translated back into English by the *North American Reviewer*, and appear before the American public as valid testimony. This is an example of the manner in which injurious tales against the Hungarians and their leaders are propagated. (The letter in question may be found in the *London Evening Mail*, 9th and 11th of April, 1849.) It is not a little remarkable, that the *North American Reviewer* should manifest such respect for the opinions and statements of anonymous correspondents of European journals, while he treats in the most contumelious manner the writings of men of established reputation in the newspapers of his own country.

ing once in his own person, and figuring as a separate authority in *Thronfolge*.

It could be wished that the articles of the North American Reviewer afforded no stronger examples of the difficulty of obtaining valid testimony against the Hungarians, than is found in his thus elevating into authorities anonymous correspondents of newspapers, and writers for French Reviews of articles whose inconsistencies with themselves and with each other should alone, it would seem, have indicated the necessity of having recourse to some more authentic sources of information. But a more striking illustration of this fact is found in the mode in which he has been forced to make his citations from the more respectable works which he has classed among his authorities. It is not our intention to enlarge upon this topic. The work of Mr. Paget has been republished in this country, and those of our readers who feel an interest in the affairs of Hungary will doubtless determine for themselves whether the pages of this writer convey the unfavorable impression of the Hungarians, which might be inferred from the partial quotations given in the North American Review.

One of the works, however, from which citations are made in the last number of that Review, seems to demand a more extended notice. This is the work by Max Schlesinger, published in Berlin, early in the last year, under the title *Aus Ungarn*. This title is more indicative of the character of the work, than that which has been given to it in the English translation, — "The War in Hungary." It is a collection of sketches, written in a spirited style, and conveying a great deal of interesting information. It is not, however, a work from which one, previously ignorant of the events of the war, and those immediately antecedent to it, could obtain an accurate knowledge of them. The writer takes for granted a certain degree of information on these subjects, on the part of the reader. It is not a history of the war, nor is it written with strict historical accuracy. Mr. Pulszky has furnished an introduction to the English translation of this work, together with notes, in which he has corrected the most important of the occasional inaccuracies into which the author has fallen.

We have not space to examine all the extracts which the North American Reviewer has given from the work of Schlesinger, or to supply the context of all those which are unintelligible as they stand in the pages of his Review. We will take the first extract there given from this work, as an example from which the reader may judge how faithfully most of the other citations express the opinions of the writer from whose pages they are drawn. This first extract is on page 212 of the North American Review for January, 1851. It is from that portion of Schlesinger's work in which he speaks of the character of the Hungarian revolution.

"The Magyar movement is widely distinguished, both by the power which called it forth and the object it had in view, from all the revolutions that convulsed Europe during the last two years. The political knowledge of the Magyars does not extend much beyond that of their own constitution; and it is remarkable with what singular affection and constancy this ancient constitution, with all its defects and abnormities, has been held fast and cherished by the people. Whilst all the other nations have sought to enlarge more or less their representative constitutions, the Magyar has dreaded any change in his, clinging to its very letter, as the Mussulman to the words of the Koran."

Thus far quotes the North American Reviewer. Schlesinger proceeds as follows:—

"The cause of this lies not so much in a belief in its excellence, as in the long struggles of the constitutional principle against the absolutist efforts of the Vienna cabinet, to oppose which the Magyars in their diet at Pressburg had no more effective weapon than the letter of their constitution, ratified as it has been by the coronation oath of every successive king. In this policy the opposite parties in the diet were agreed; indeed, for a long time past, it had been the safest, nay, the only possible course. The liberal Hungarian did not cling to his ancient constitution, as the free citizen of the United States does to his, from a conviction of its excellence, but because he knew that the concession of any single point would strengthen the absolutist government in Vienna. With this feeling the Left party at Pressburg, advocated and held up to view the articles of the constitution long enough to endear them to the less clear-sighted mass of the people.

"The extension of the constitution upon its legitimate basis appeared to the liberal party to be unadvisable until the absolutist principle was crushed by the March revolution. This extension

was sought and carried out by the abrogation of old abuses, by the introduction of laws adapted to the times, and by the creation of an independent and responsible ministry. That this last measure entailed a breach with Austria was known to those men who strove to accomplish it; yet they were short-sighted enough to believe that such a rupture might consist with the union of the two countries in the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine.

"The ancient constitution, which, in accordance with strict legal form, had undergone material alterations, with the consent of the majority of the national representatives and the sanction of the king, remained the basis of the last revolution. Austria declared herself not bound by the Hungarian constitution, on the ground that it had been fundamentally modified; forgetting or denying that the very essence of that constitution provided for its gradual and independent progression, with the consent of the majority in the chambers and the crown. By the renunciation of this principle, Austria, from the very first, destroyed the possibility of effecting any good understanding with the Magyars, and the latter had no longer a ground upon which to resist the centralizing policy of Austria."—*War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 114–117.

Another extract from Schlesinger which calls for comment is that given on pp. 234, 235 of the *North American Review* for January, 1851, relating to the proceedings in the diet held at Szegedin (July, 1849). This is one of the passages in Schlesinger to which the editor, Mr. Pulszky, has appended a note, stating that it is *incorrect*. The *North American Reviewer* quotes the passage, but omits the note. Schlesinger appears from this, and some other passages, to labor under some misapprehension respecting the conduct of the Hungarian government in regard to the insurgent Servians and Wallachs, and to suppose that they had not adopted every means in their power to effect a pacification. In place of all other comment upon this subject, we will give an extract from the speech of the prime minister, Szemere, delivered on the 21st of July, 1849, at the opening of the diet held at Szegedin.

"The next wish of the nation is the pacification of the races who have been incited to insurrection. Terrible is the misery of the Wallachs and Servians, who have exiled themselves from their own homes, but yet more terrible are the cruelties which they have exercised upon the Magyars and Germans. The blindness of these people, which permits them to be excited to rebellion by the intrigues of the dynasty which oppresses them, is incon-

ceivable. But yet more inconceivable is the unprincipled heartlessness of their leaders, who in various ways, if not indeed directly, are wasting the strength of the people in the service of that very dynasty with whom all the sufferings of the people originate. What have not the people, the Wallach, the Servian, and the Magyar people, suffered in this beautiful country? Every thing, every thing; all the sufferings of servitude. When and how long did they suffer? Since the memory of man, until 1848. Who governed, who ruled, in Hungary until 1848? The Vienna cabinet, the Austrian ministry. It was this government which held the agricultural population under the yoke, so that neither their thoughts nor their property were their own. It was this government which made the Wallachs the servants of their lords. It was this government which prohibited the meeting of the synod of the old Greek Church. It was this government which deprived the Servian people of their ancient rights in regard to their liberty in ecclesiastical matters. This government subjected the Wallachs to the Servian clergy. It was this government which bound the inhabitants of the military frontier to the soil. Finally, it was this Austrian government which kept these races in a state of constant irritation against each other, so that those who lived on the same soil, under the same sky, drew into their souls, with God's air, only mutual hatred. The executive power returned into the hands of the nation only in 1848. And how did the Hungarians use this power? They abolished the tithes and *robot*. They proclaimed equality of rights and obligations, without distinction of race or religion. They convoked the synod of the Greek Church, and appointed for the management of its affairs a separate section in the appropriate department of the ministry. They liberated the inhabitants of the frontier from their servitude, and thus the great masses of Wallachs and Servians living there not only obtained the right to elect representatives to the diet, — a right before attached, not to race, but to nobility, — but were also freed from their military bondage; so that they were placed on an equal footing with the other inhabitants of the country, while their material prosperity was, at the same time, secured by important concessions.

“It was thus that the Hungarian government entered upon the exercise of its power. The foundation of fraternity, of equality and freedom, without distinction of language or religion, was laid; nothing remained but to adapt these three sacred principles in detail. It was then that the intrigues of the soulless dynasty — which had concealed from the people the gift of freedom that had been bestowed upon them — caused this misguided people to break out into insurrection, at the very moment when they ought to have been celebrating the festival of their liberation.

"Gentlemen, you know all this well. I do not therefore enter into details. But it was needful for me to say thus much, for the misguided people are ignorant of all this, — that people who were good, quiet, and patient in their servitude, and now, infatuated, are shedding their blood in the contest against freedom. Europe does not know this. Europe sees in the rebellion of the Wallachs and Servians a proof, not that the Hungarian government has bestowed freedom on all the inhabitants of the country without distinction, but a proof that it designs to keep them in servitude. And this is one of the principal reasons why the government regards it as its chief aim to pacify the people at any price, so that it can be done consistently with justice. I remember with grief the many thousand Magyars and Germans who have fallen victims to the fury of these people. But I feel pity for the murderers of those victims also; for a deceived, infatuated people, even in their sin, merit not condemnation only, but compassion. Had the Hungarian government, in the beginning, answered cruelty with cruelty, there would perhaps have been peace, if only the peace of the grave. But this was not done. Every means of moral influence was put in use, to bind once more the bonds of brotherhood. Explanations, proclamations, were distributed by hundreds of thousands. We used every honorable means that the press afforded. We supported the representatives in their efforts for pacification, and we aided those who have become victims of the persecutions of their own kindred, in consequence of these efforts. We knew that the leaders of the Moldavian movement exercised great influence over the Wallachs, and we tried to neutralize this influence. We knew also that the Servian rebellion was nourished from Servia; and we did not delay to communicate to the Servian prince and his government our views in regard to the rights of the different races in Hungary. These views were received with full approbation. We did not delay a moment in our work of pacification, or in presenting our principles in detail. And what was the result? This; — when we were victorious, our views were satisfactory; but when the star of our fortune began to be clouded, we were answered with evasion and postponement. In a word, the most upright, the most honorable conduct upon our part, met only with deceit and treachery. Our object in this has been no other than, on the one hand, to hasten the security of the independence of the country, and of civil liberty; on the other, to restore the reign of mild humanity, so that the chief glory of our revolution, a mild and peaceful development, might be kept unpolluted by the bloody footprints of terrorism. Our conditions were so framed that we could not grant more without sacrificing the unity of the state, and less we did not think sufficient. They were so framed that, certainly,

no country ever gave such rights to the smaller nationalities dwelling within its boundaries. We expressed every thing in clear language, with precision, abstaining entirely from those false promises with which Austria is accustomed to deceive the people, — Austria, which promised the Servians a Woiwodina, but which gave them only the name ; — which promised freedom to the inhabitants of the frontier, who, however, are still serfs, glebe bound, and forced to send their ten or twenty thousand men to serve in foreign wars ; — Austria, which proclaimed equality of rights for all nationalities ; yet the Servians, Wallachs, Galicians, and Croats are obliged to use the German language as soon as they pass their own thresholds ; — which promised to the Bukowina, that, though it be only a small territory, the vernacular language should be introduced into the schools, and then explained this promise to mean, that all instruction should be given in the German language, but that it should be permitted, at the same time, to teach the rules of the vernacular tongue.

These efforts for the pacification of the insurgent populations, we judged to be suitable and just. Hitherto they have remained without effect ; but we hope that they may yet become effectual. We are responsible to you in this world, and, beyond this world, to God ; and we have wished so to conduct this government, that the All-powerful, who holds the fate of nations in his hand, may say of the Hungarians, This nation deserves to be free, for it knew how to be just to other nations, to whom it has given land from its own land, rights bought with its own blood, and to whom, even after they had carried slaughter and devastation through the land, it was still generous enough to extend the olive-branch of peace with brotherly hand." *

The work of Schlesinger, notwithstanding some occasional inaccuracies, is a very valuable contribution to the history of the Hungarian struggle. It is of so interesting and popular a character, that it will, undoubtedly, soon be republished in this country. It is the less necessary, therefore, to make many extracts from it. But since we have not space to comment upon all the citations made from it in the *North American Review*, we will give a few passages, illustrative of the author's views on some points, in regard to which they might be misapprehended, if judged of only by the extracts there offered. Schlesinger thus explains the motives which induced Jellachich to reject all the conciliatory proposals of the Hungarian ministry : —

* *A Magyar Forradalom Férfiai*, Szilágyi Sándortól. Pesten, 1850.
VOL. L. — 4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. II.

"The Prince [Esterházy, member of the Hungarian ministry] had several conferences with Jellachich. The ministry at Pesth declared that they desired nothing more than a peaceful settlement of affairs, and that the Croats had only to come forward in a constitutional manner in the National Assembly, where they enjoyed equal rights, and all their reasonable desires would be satisfied.

"But how could such proposals obtain a hearing, while Jellachich was at the same time secretly receiving the promise of Austrian support, — a promise which led him to expect an easier attainment of his purposes than in the Hungarian Diet, where, at most, he could obtain only partial concessions from the majority of the Magyars ?

"True, indeed, that, among the thirteen millions represented at Pesth, only five millions were Magyars ; and the statician may ask with surprise, why the Slaves had recourse to arms, when they were sure of a victory in Parliament. Jellachich and the court knew very well that such statistical reasoning was fallacious, since the Slovacks and a great portion of the Wallachs and Croats, with all the Germans of the country, were in the Magyar interest." — *War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 30, 31.

Schlesinger exposes, in a few words, the absurdity of the supposition, that what is called the Slavonic movement in Hungary was a general one among the Hungarians of that race, and that the Magyars stood alone in the contest against Austria.

"The war has proved this truth ["that the Slavish movement did not originate with a majority of the inhabitants of the country"] to demonstration. Slaves fought by thousands in the ranks of the Hungarians, but no Magyars in the Slavish army. The Serbs, Wallachs, Slovacks, Croats, Slavonians, Illyrians, and the Hungarian Ruthenes, notwithstanding all their boasted majority, were unable to obtain the upper hand. Austria even, with all her resources, succumbed ; and the mightiest monarch in the world had to be drawn into an alliance, to terminate a war which, according to the protestations of the Austrian ministry, was carried on by 'a small, rebellious fraction.'

"If the Hungarian revolution was really the struggle of a 'small fraction,' for what reason did the *large* fraction avoid the contest in the diet which the former party invited ? How came it that the weaker party were victorious ? On what pretext were the 'overwhelming masses of loyal subjects' punished by the loss of their ancient constitution, for the sins of 'a handful of rebels' ? Marvellous logic and justice this in Austrian policy ! " — *War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 30, 31.

Schlesinger gives too favorable a view, in some respects, of the character of Jellachich, but he is very far from representing him as the champion of freedom, when he invaded Hungary at the head of the imperial forces.

"It has already been observed, that the frontier regiments formed the flower of the army with which the Ban took the field, to detach the provinces of the south from the crown of St. Stephen. He held the command, as Lieutenant Field-Marshal, in the emperor's name; the majority of his officers were in the Austrian service; the cannon, taken from the magazines of the frontier, were served by imperial artillery-men, and his cavalry consisted of the Banal Hussars. Great exertions were used to raise and equip this army, whose achievements, however, make but a sorry figure in the annals of the war. As for the 30,000 men who roved after the Ban's army, helter-skelter, most of them dispersed again before they had time to gain any knowledge of the world; those who remained with the army got accoutred by degrees, but were always a rapacious, worthless rabble, ready only to burn and pillage.

"With this army, Jellachich passed the Drave on the 9th of September, and entered upon Hungarian soil. A man of such high cultivation of mind could not be stopped by the formality of a declaration of war, — that absurdity in the law of nations; he came with no avowed intention of detaching Croatia from the crown of Hungary, nor as an invading foe; he announced himself in the capacity of Imperial Lieutenant Field-Marshal, come with the declared purpose of putting down the revolution in Hungary.

"The fact, that up to this time there had been no trace of a revolution in Hungary, was not allowed to suggest any question or difficulty to enlightened minds; if a revolution had not taken place, one must at all hazards be provoked, in order to furnish a pretext at Vienna for interference. This task Jellachich took upon himself, like a well-trained dog, which is taught to set two bears on one another for the amusement of the spectators and the profit of his master.

"If Jellachich imagined that he could win for his nation more liberty by the sword, aided by Austrian diplomacy and cannon, than they had received from the Magyars by the last act of the Diet, he was simply a fool. If, on the other hand, he was aware of the real merits of the question, and that he was leading his countrymen to slaughter, merely to satisfy the longing of the court to obtain absolute possession of Hungary, he was guilty of a heinous crime." — *War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 55-57.

It is not possible to treat with any degree of fulness a subject so extensive as this Hungarian question, within the limits of a review article. We leave still untouched several topics on which we would willingly have offered some comments. It has been our aim to lay before our readers the leading facts of the case, and to offer some explanations in regard to those points which have been made more especially the subject of misrepresentation.

M. L. P.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. In Three Volumes. Boston: Little & Brown. 1849. 8vo. pp. 1094, 1220, 1406.

A New Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology, and Geography, partly based upon the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. Revised, with Numerous Corrections and Additions. By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 8vo. pp. 1040.

A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon, founded on the Larger Latin-German Lexicon of DR. WILLIAM FREUND. With Additions and Corrections from the Lexicons of Gesner, Facioliati, Scheller, Georges, &c. By E. A. ANDREWS, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. Royal 8vo. pp. 1664.

THE works whose titles we have transcribed seem, as they stand before us in their huge forms and their scholarly inscriptions, to constitute in themselves a library. And, indeed, what is there so essential in the library of any student or reader, as good dictionaries or lexicons? One thing is certain, that such noble volumes as these, so full, so thorough, and elaborate, render useless a great many books that are retained in libraries by sufferance, because of their occasional but insecure help. In one of the religious papers of this city, a notice of one of these dictionaries is introduced with a thanksgiving to God on account of those patient men to whom he gives ability to make lexicons. How many of the scholar monks of the Middle Ages would have told their beads in grateful prayer a thousand times over, for either of these volumes! We feel that we have a treasure in possessing them, and we cannot but think that even the school-

boys who are just entering upon the study of the humanities will find the weariness of their task relieved because of the facilities for its thorough execution.

The work first named above, though it bears the imprint of our most distinguished book-publishing firm in Boston, is from the London press. By an arrangement made with the English publishers by Messrs. Little & Brown, an edition of Dr. Smith's noble volumes was printed in London for this country, and, what is more, our scholars can purchase the work for half its London price, though its materials are precisely the same as those of the copies circulated in Great Britain. We are glad that so favorable an arrangement for all parties has been made, and we hope that the example will be followed in other cases. The work is a splendid specimen of art, as well as of scholarship, and its cost is less than that of any similar work now to be purchased.

It is a complete compend of classical literature, history, and biography for more than two thousand years. The results of the most laborious investigations and researches, the deciphering of old monuments and inscriptions, the philological inquiries of all the Continental scholars, as well as the collation of the best annotated editions of the classics, have contributed to authenticate the contents of these volumes. Let any reader turn to any title of the more marked men of antiquity, and he will be able to form some idea of the industry whose fruits are before him. Homer, Socrates, Alexander, Demosthenes, Plato, Cicero, are treated with the familiarity of contemporary biographies. The contents comprise all matters of Greek and Roman history down to A. D. 476, and of Byzantine history down to 1453. The ancient Christian writers are included. St. Jerome figures among others who bear his name (Hieronymus),—in some respects no unfit companionship for him. Painters, sculptors, and architects, with their surviving works, find due treatment. In writing of matters which have a controversial aspect in theology or philosophy, the editor has pursued the method of common sense, to the equal disregard of ancient prejudices and modern mysticism. Wood-cuts of ancient coins illustrate the pages. Very elaborate tables of chronology, parallel years and dynasties, are given in the third volume. Of course, no one mind, however stored, would have been competent for this noble undertaking. Dr. Smith has had the assistance of thirty-five scholars, whose initials follow their respective contributions.

A fourth volume, consisting of a "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography," has been published under the same editorial supervision.

After the completion of his great work, Dr. Smith and his brother projected a condensation or abridgment of it, to serve as

a Classical Dictionary for schools. It is this Abridgment which forms the basis of the second work above named, edited by the diligent and pains-taking Dr. Anthon, whose labors as editor of a greatly improved edition of Lempriere's antiquated Dictionary, ten years ago, eminently qualified him for the task. Dr. Anthon affirms that he has added more than fourteen hundred independent articles to Dr. Smith's Abridgment, besides spending an incalculable amount of care and research in correction, in verification, and enlargement. It is only by close comparison and frequent use that we can be prepared to judge of the relative merits of the English and American editions of the Abridgment. We are willing, however, till we have pursued such a comparison, to accord to Dr. Anthon all that he may claim for his labor. School-boys and college students, if they appreciate the toil that has been spent in their behalf, will not fail to thank him for his work. We should infer, from the very full notes which he attaches to his editions of classic authors, that his faults lean to the side of pity and mercy towards tyros.

We have at repeated intervals taken in hand the solid volume edited by Dr. Andrews, and regard it as a work of which we may feel proud as a specimen of the scholarship of the country. What publisher among us, twenty or thirty years ago, would have ventured on an undertaking which the Harpers have now so confidently risked? The Lexicon indicates an era in our academical and collegiate history. Not that we were without a Latin Lexicon of eminent accuracy and value. On the contrary, the compilation from Facciolati and Forcellini, by Messrs. Leverett and Torrey, answered every needful purpose of common use, and is not likely now to be superseded. The introduction of certain philological and philosophical principles in the apparatus of the work is the great novelty of the volume now before us. The basis of it is the large work of Dr. Freund, condensed by a retrenchment of citations, while the peculiar features of the original are all retained. All other Lexicons are content to name the authors who use a word; Dr. Freund refers us to the very place in each author whom he cites. In the author's original Preface, which is translated by President Woolsey of Yale College, we have the philosophical principles on which the work is constructed, and which are mechanically illustrated in its typography. Words are regarded as embracing, under their original, their acquired, and their metaphorical significations, the following elements: — Grammatical, Etymological, Exegetical, Synonymous, Historical, Rhetorical, and Statistic. Where the uses of any word involve several or all of these elements, they are stated consecutively in the order of their development, so that we have the whole philosophy of the language, as well as an index of its ingredients. A dry study is thus greatly enlivened, and we are

continually impressed anew with the marvellous and curious processes which are combined in the human faculty of speech, in the invention of language, in its intangible creations, and with its perpetual hazards, which are held in check by laws somewhat more stringent than conventionalisms.

The translation of Dr. Freund's work has been made by Professor Robbins of Middlebury College, and Professor Turner of the Union Theological Seminary. The editor, Dr. Andrews, so far aided by others, has performed, we infer, the rest of the heavy task, by verifying all the citations of Dr. Freund, by condensing unnecessary redundancies, and by rectifying errors. These joint labors have given to us a work which deserves many years of distinguished favor. We hope that the seal of general approbation will give to the laborers a reward congenial to a scholar, whether pecuniary gain does or does not attend it.

The History of the Boston Athenæum, with Biographical Notices of its Deceased Founders. By JOSIAH QUINCY. Cambridge: Metcalf & Co. 1851. 8vo. pp. 264 and 104.

THE readers of the Memoir of Rev. J. S. Buckminster, by his sister, will remember that many of the pages of that delightful book contain references to the Boston Athenæum in its day of small things. The institution itself has a history, — a history worthy of being told. And who could tell that history better than one always the friend of the institution and its founders, and for many years its President? Mr. Quincy, whose labors will evidently cease only with his life, proves his love of usefulness, and his wisdom too, in employing his pen to so good a purpose. With that careful statement of all statistical and financial particulars which is needed to authenticate the rise and growth of any public institution among us, Mr. Quincy combines a literary history and a series of personal memoirs, which have an independent interest. The Athenæum originated in the "Anthology Club." The merchants of Boston have heretofore most liberally sustained it, by making themselves shareholders, and by large free gifts. Not the least interesting volume on the shelves of the new and splendid edifice in Beacon Street will henceforward be that which records the rise and growth of the institution itself.

The Half-Century; or a History of Changes that have taken place, and Events that have transpired, chiefly in the United States, between 1800 and 1850. By EMERSON DAVIS, D. D.

With an Introduction by MARK HOPKINS, D. D. Boston: Tappan & Whittemore. 1851. 12mo. pp. 444.

THE contents of this volume, and the way in which its subjects are treated, furnish no unfit simile of the period of time of whose changes and inventions it makes a record. We expect to suffer from confused dreams as we close it before retiring to rest, such a strange jumble of materials has the book introduced into our brain. The theme is too ponderous for the writer to manage well. He has indeed gathered together many interesting facts, but he did not see the whole of his subject. His religious prepossessions are apparent. Not a word is said of the growth of the Baptist denomination, of the Ministry at Large, of the extension of the Papal hierarchy over our land, nor of a score of other religious topics, which are vastly more important in their relations to the age than the issue with Dr. Bushnell. The book is on the whole, though with marked exceptions, good as far as it goes, but not what it should be with such a title as it bears. It reminds us of a Chinese map, in which the celestial empire fills the great central space, and all other countries appear as little islands.

The Island World of the Pacific: being the Personal Narrative and Results of Travel through the Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands, and other Parts of Polynesia. By Rev. HENRY T. CHEEVER. With Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 406.

A CHARMING book, which we can read with confidence in the author's statements, and with unflagging interest in the fresh scenes which he brings so vividly before us. It is a most instructive book for young persons. The ocean paradises of which it makes report to us will, before long, be visited by summer tourists. We might specify blemishes in the book, but we forbear.

Waverley Poetry: being the Poems scattered through the Waverley Novels. Attributed to Anonymous Sources, but presumed to be written by Sir Walter Scott. With Titles and Index. Boston: Munroe & Francis. 1851. 12mo. pp. 268.

THIS is certainly a very heterogeneous collection of scraps, carols, datches, and mottoes, with now and then a ballad or a lyric. There are some beautiful gems scattered through the volume, which are worthy of being brought together under a title bearing the name which thirty years ago was in the mouth of every reader of English.

American Unitarian Biography. Memoirs of Individuals who have been distinguished by their Writings, Character, and Efforts in the Cause of Liberal Christianity. Edited by WILLIAM WARE. Vol. II. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1851. 12mo. pp. 452.

WE are glad that Mr. Ware has found encouragement to continue his grateful undertaking. We would commend to all our readers the support of so thankworthy a purpose, in order that many more volumes may follow. The present contains Memoirs of Rev. Drs. Pierce, Channing, Tuckerman, Parker, and Bartlett, Rev. Messrs. Buckminster, Thacher, and Forster, Professor Frisbie, and Judges Story and Howe. The Memoir of Channing is by Rev. Dr. Furness, and that of Judge Story is by Rev. William Newell.

Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Regal Succession of Great Britain. By AGNES STRICKLAND. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 374.

MISS STRICKLAND has won the right of occupancy of a portion of the literary field which is most rich and attractive, and she has shown her ability to labor in it with unquestioned success. Margaret Tudor, Magdalene of France, and Mary of Lorraine, are commemorated with a practised skill in this volume. Many original materials are now for the first time wrought into their biographies. The promised life of Mary, Queen of Scots, will be looked for with a keen anticipation. The hints which the authoress drops in her Preface concerning that long promised work lead us to expect something very elaborate.

Essays and Reviews. By EDWIN P. WHIPPLE. In 2 vols. Second Edition. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 421, 408.

UPON the first publication of Mr. Whipple's Essays, about two years since, we took occasion to speak at considerable length of their merits; and upon the publication of his Lectures, a few months afterwards, an esteemed friend again extended a cordial greeting to him through our pages. We have therefore little to add at the present time to what has already been said. Besides the papers comprised in the first edition, the present edition contains two articles which are now first collected, — the essay on Henry Fielding, from the North American Review, and the re-

viewal of Dana's Poems and Prose Writings, from our own journal. The volumes now before us are stereotyped, and are issued in uniform style with the author's Lectures on Literature and Life. It is almost needless to add, that they are fine specimens of the typographical art; since the names of the publishers would alone be a sufficient guarantee that nothing more could be wished in the way of paper, types, or binding.

From Mr. Whipple's minute acquaintance with the subject in all its relations, we have long felt a strong desire that he might be induced to prepare a critical and popular History of English Literature. For such a task he is admirably qualified by all his studies; and we happen to know that he possesses ample and valuable materials for a work which, like Mr. Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature, should be an honor to our country. So far as our knowledge extends, there is no work that covers the ground over which a complete and well digested survey of English literature would pass. There are, indeed, valuable publications on special points and individual writers; but there is not a single work which presents a consistent and judicious history of the noblest literature that the world has ever seen. Chambers's Cyclopædia, and the numerous minor publications which have at different times fallen under our notice, are, in some respects, useful and necessary books for reference. But something more than they contain is imperatively called for; and it is discreditable to our regard for the great and immortal names with which our literary history abounds, that such a work does not exist. We commend this whole subject to Mr. Whipple's attention, with a full assurance that he is entirely competent to supply the want, and thus place his own name in a still more honorable place than it now occupies.

Celebrated Saloons, by MADAME GAY; and *Parisian Letters*, by MADAME GIRARDIN. Translated from the French, by L. WIL-LARD. 18mo. pp. 260.

AN extremely interesting and attractive work. The scenes are described and conversations related with much vivacity, and in a very attractive way. Some of the most remarkable subjects and persons of the time are brought forward in so fresh and lively a manner, as to give them a new interest. French life and thought, French society and spirit, are reflected in such a way from the saloons of Madame de Stäel, Josephine, Countess Merlin, &c., that we seem to be present and taking a personal part in what is said and done. It certainly must be considered one of the most pleasing and valuable of that class of books which the French

know how to make better than any other people. Books of this character are to most readers much more interesting than elaborate history or grave philosophy. The translator has rendered a good service to the reading public by bringing it so well into English, and it should be regarded as a most agreeable addition to our libraries.

The Old Red Sandstone: or New Walks in an Old Field. By HUGH MILLER. Illustrated with numerous Engravings. From the Fourth London Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. pp. 288.

THIS was the first scientific essay which brought into notice the genius of Mr. Miller. Self-taught as he was in the science of geology, the peculiar value of his two works lies in their adaptation to popular instruction. Though he uses of course the technical terms, — which we cannot but hope will one day be simplified, or at least shortened, — he is the most intelligible of geological writers, and enlivens his most erudite pages with scintillations of thought and wisdom, which address the feelings and the judgment of his readers. The illustrations are admirable.

Principles of Zoölogy: teaching the Structure, Development, Distribution, and Natural Arrangement of the Races of Animals, living and extinct. With numerous Illustrations. Part I. Comparative Physiology. For the Use of Schools and Colleges. By LOUIS AGASSIZ and A. A. GOULD. Revised Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. pp. 248.

THE reputation of this text-book of Zoölogy is already well established. By the simplicity of its method and the thoroughness of its analytical classification, as well as by its recognition of the most recent discoveries and hypotheses, it takes precedence of all other manuals upon its great theme. Messrs. Gould & Lincoln are doing good service to the community by the publication of these excellent scientific works.

Faust: a Dramatic Poem, by GOETHE. Translated into English Prose, with Notes, etc., by A. HAYWARD, Esq. A new Edition. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 322.

FOR all who do not read German, Hayward is the authorized interpreter of Goethe's Faust, his translation being universally

acknowledged to be by far the best. The Boston publishers have given us in a very handsome shape a book which in the London edition is too costly for popular circulation. An apparatus of Preface, Notes, and Appendix furnishes abundant illustrations of all that is obscure in the masterpiece of the great idol of German literature.

Miscellaneous Essays. By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. Boston : Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 250.

THIS is the third volume of the collected works of De Quincey, a genius unrivalled in one peculiar vein of writing. Mr. Fields is more than a publisher of this series of striking works. He has done what the author of them could never be persuaded to do, — has collected from various sources the scattered productions of the only surviving member of a famed literary circle, and has put them within the reach of a large number of readers. We set a high value upon the three volumes, and look with interest for more.

Thanksgiving for the Union : A Discourse delivered in the Federal Street Meeting-house in Boston, on Thanksgiving Day, November 28, 1850. By EZRA S. GANNETT. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 22.

The Fugitive Slave Law : A Discourse delivered in the Congregational Church in West Bridgewater, November 17, 1850.

By J. G. FORMAN. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 36.

The Limits of Civil Obedience : A Sermon preached in the First Church, Dorchester, January 12, 1851. By NATHANIEL HALL. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 26.

The State of the Nation, considered in a Sermon for Thanksgiving Day, preached at the Melodeon, November 28, 1850. By THEODORE PARKER. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 38.

The Great Controversy of States and People. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 12mo. pp. 45.

Duty to Government and to God : A Sermon preached in the Warren Street Church, Boston, on Thanksgiving Day, November 29, 1850. By OTIS A. SKINNER. Boston : A. Tompkins & Co. 8vo. pp. 24.

THE above are the titles all of the pamphlets which have passed beneath our own eyes on the great theme which now agitates the nation. We have seen in the newspapers the titles of twice as many more that have been published, and references to scores that have been preached, on the same pregnant theme.

We were about to say, that whoever would take the pains to collect and read the whole of them would have the materials from which to form a fair and instructed judgment on the whole case at issue. But this would be to advance a proposition scarcely less vague than if we were to say, that any one who had all the letters of the alphabet before him would have all the materials for the statement of all truth and wisdom. We should be glad to give in our pages a well considered article upon the *Ethics of a Compromise*, and upon that most practical of all casuistical questions, the relations between conscience and law. We are withheld from uttering the thoughts now in our mind, because on all such matters we have a dread of all one-sided statements. Some of the most stirring pages of social and political history have brought under discussion the same casuistry of compromise, the same rebellion of conscience against law. When the noble and ever to be honored Sir Thomas More, Lord High Chancellor of England, refused to assent to the act which legalized the divorce of Henry the Eighth and Catharine, the following conversation was held in his examination before the Council at Lambeth. More had raised the plea of conscience. Says the *Abbot of Westminster*, "But you ought to think your conscience erroneous, when you have against you the whole council of the nation." *More*. "I should, if I had not for me a still greater council, — the whole council of Christendom." (*More's Works*, p. 1447.)

Dr. Gannett presents some of the causes for devout gratitude which are to be found in the union of these States, suggests some of the calamities which would ensue from its dissolution, and asserts that he sees no reason why the recent legislation upon slavery should bring about disunion. Mr. Skinner comes nearest to Dr. Gannett in the loyalty to law which is insisted upon in his Discourse, though he asserts that, while it is rebellion to resist a law by force, it is not unloyal to say that we cannot obey an oppressive law. Mr. Hall limits the allegiance due to civil government by the soul's sense of duty to God, and endeavours to establish this principle, and to guard it against abuse. Mr. Forman enters into a criticism of the Fugitive Slave Law, compares it with a provision in the law of Moses, and distinctly urges the duty of passive resistance. Mr. Parker's sermon is more general in its contents, making but incidental allusion to the law, and presenting a graphic and interesting *résumé*, in curt phrases and striking statements, of the comparative good and evil in the workings of our national system.

The anonymous pamphlet on the Great Controversy of States and People contains some admirable thoughts, and opens trains of sound reasoning. A little more thoroughness in its discussions, and a more careful elaboration of its main points, would give to it almost a judicial character.

"A Centennial Discourse, delivered September 9, 1850, before the First Church and Society in Athol, with an Appendix. By Samuel F. Clarke, Minister of the First Church. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1851." (8vo. pp. 95.) This is one of the most interesting and lively of our numerous town and church commemorative discourses. Mr. Clarke has the true spirit of fondness for such a work, and has executed it with fine taste and with admirable skill. Its reference to the perils of the wilderness from the Indians, its piquant narrative of parish difficulties, its anecdotes of the change in the mode of singing, and of the church member who had *drank* a little and *smoked* a great deal, as well as its general felicity of style and its careful antiquarian investigations, will give the pamphlet a value to a wide circle of readers.

"Christ the Son of God. A Discourse in Review of the Rev. Dr. Wilkes's Sermon, entitled 'Who is Christ?' delivered in the Unitarian Church, Montreal, January 19, 1851. By John Cordner. Montreal: James Potts. 1851." (8vo. pp. 28.) "The Philosophic Origin and Historic Progress of the Doctrine of the Trinity: A Lecture delivered in the Unitarian Church, Montreal, January 26, 1851. By John Cordner. Montreal. 1851." (8vo. pp. 22.) The circumstances which led to the delivery and the publication of these two sermons are stated on their pages. We could not name two other productions, in all our abundance of controversial literature, which we should regard as better suited to effect their purpose than these two sermons of Mr. Cordner. We have been surprised at the amount of instructive matter, of direct argument, of Biblical criticism, and of learned research, which they embrace. The writer's directness and simplicity of style adapt the discourses to popular use. His learning does not obscure his meaning. His sketch of the origin and history of the doctrine of the Trinity is a masterly performance. We hope that the Unitarian Association will reprint these sermons, and give them a wide circulation.

"Marks of the True Church, by Austin Craig (Peapack, Somerset County, New Jersey). Reprinted from the 'Christian Union and Religious Review.'" (8vo. pp. 16.) The causes of the division of Christendom into sects being briefly stated, Mr. Craig proceeds to present, in the language of Scripture, and with brief comments, four marks of the True Church, namely, Unity, Sanctity, Universality, and Apostolicity. With no waste of argument, the writer expresses himself effectively, and with the Gospel warrant.

"Minutes of a General Convention of the Christian Church, held at Marion, New York, October, 1850. Philadelphia. 1851." (8vo. pp. 24.) The especial objects which occupied this convention were the adoption of measures for raising \$100,000 to found a University, and for a more perfect and general organiza-

tion of the Christian denomination, and discussions with reports upon various matters of reform and Christian enterprise.

"Remarks on an Article in the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, concerning a recent Discourse delivered before the Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts. By Edwards A. Park, Abbot Professor in Andover Theological Seminary." (8vo. pp. 48.) We took up this pamphlet, intending only to glance over its pages, but were so fascinated by its rich diction, and the acuteness and precision of its deprecatory arguments, that we could not deny ourselves an honest perusal. The Princeton Reviewer did foul injustice to Professor Park, but the Professor, with admirable temper, yet with the very keenest skill, parries every aim, and nobly keeps erect. The charm of the pamphlet lies in the felicity with which diffuseness and repetition are wholly freed from weariness by a constant variety in the turn of expression, and the perpetual freshness of phrases used simply to say the same things over and over again. The controversy relates to that remarkable sermon of Professor Park's, entitled "The Theology of the Intellect and that of the Feelings." The perusal of the pamphlet before us will brighten the wits of the dullest theologian. As an incidental illustration of the unrivalled literary excellence of the Scriptures, it is of high value.

"The Mormons. A Discourse delivered before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, March 26, 1850. By Thomas L. Kane. Philadelphia: King & Baird. 1850." (8vo. pp. 92.) We apprehend that the perusal of this pamphlet would surprise many persons who know nothing of the Mormons, save what they have learned from newspaper paragraphs. Mr. Kane gives us a narrative of personal experience and observation among this singular people. In a very spirited and earnest plea in their behalf, he represents them as a sincere, pure, laborious, and much injured community, whose faith is not composed entirely of stupid and fanatical ingredients, and whose mode of life would do credit to any class of human beings. We thank Mr. Kane for a pleasant and profitable hour with his Discourse, but we should be glad to ask him some questions.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Grote's History of Greece.—This voluminous and most admirable history, beyond comparison the best of the eight works which bear the same title, has already been reviewed in our pages up to the eighth vol-

ume, and has been highly commended by us. A Boston firm has had the enterprise to undertake its republication, and we hope that they will be abundantly rewarded. John P. Jewett & Co. have already issued two volumes of their reprint, which will be embraced in ten volumes, to appear at brief intervals. The reprint is from the second London edition. These volumes contain Legendary Greece, and the historic period to the reign of Peisistratus.

Lavengro, The Scholar, The Gypsy, The Priest. — The author of this medley, George Borrow, Esq., has already engaged a welcome hearing from the lovers of racy literature by his two popular works, "The Bible in Spain," and "The Gypsies of Spain." We have received his new work too late to enable us to pronounce upon it in our present number. We promise ourselves high pleasure from its perusal. George P. Putnam, of New York, has published a handsome edition of it (12mo, pp. 550), and by the efforts which he made to secure the sheets from England, and to present the work in a proper form, he is entitled to the market.

There are some fine passages and some gleaming thoughts in "The Bards of the Bible, by George Gilfillan." (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 378.) A writer of any sensibility and skill could hardly deal with such a theme without a degree of success, for his material is in a great measure already wrought into form. The book is disfigured, however, by much faulty rhetoric, and by remarks which shock the taste of the reader, while offences against reverence are by no means rare in it.

For poetry we have before us "The Poetical Remains of the late Mary Elizabeth Lee, with a Biographical Memoir by S. Gilman, D. D." (Charleston, S. C.: Walker & Richards. 1851. 12mo. pp. 224.) And "The Dove and The Eagle." (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 27.) Miss Lee's poems are characterized by heartiness and simplicity rather than by any brilliancy of genius. Their topics are naturally found in the common scenes of life, and are treated with a healthful tone and with a pure spirit. Dr. Gilman's Memoir is dictated by a respectful affection for one who was worthy of it. The Dove and the Eagle is a little piece of covert satire on some present agitations, set forth in an airy colloquy between the two birds as representatives of certain human qualities which they respectively symbolize. One must read the poem for himself if he would know its drift.

"Malleville, a Franconia Story, by the Author of the Rollo Books," (New York, Harper & Brothers, 18mo, pp. 219,) is an attractive little volume, with a profitable moral. Its scenery is in the interesting northern region of our own Franconia, and its pictures of winter sports will fix the gaze of the boys at least.

Messrs. Crosby & Nichols have republished, for the Massachusetts Temperance Society, the Essay on the Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease, by William B. Carpenter. To this Essay was awarded the prize of one hundred guineas offered by an English gentleman. Mr. Carpenter, a son of the late Rev. Dr. Carpenter, is one of the most distinguished physiologists of the age, and his Essay has been highly commended.

Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. will soon publish works under the following titles: — "The Worcester Pulpit; being an Historical Account of each Religious Society in the City of Worcester, from its Organization to the Present Time, by Rev. Elam Smalley, D. D." "The True Remedy for Woman's Wrongs, by Catharine E. Beecher." "The Religion of Geology, and its Collateral Sciences, by President Hitchcock." "Life in Varied Phases, by Mrs. Catharine H. Butler." And a new and improved edition of "Margaret, a Tale of the Real and Ideal," by Rev. Mr. Judd.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields will continue their publication of a complete collection of De Quincey's Works by a fourth volume, containing "The Cæsars." They have in press a second edition of the "Memoirs of Dr. and Joseph S. Buckminster." Also, "Warreniana," a collection in the style of the Rejected Addresses; Goethe's Wilhelm Meister; a new romance by Hawthorne; and the Poems of Henry T. Tuckerman.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

A Pagan's Opinion of Christianity. — Proclamation of a Mandarin. — We have read with interest (in the *Journal des Debats*, taken from a Chinese paper of the 29th of October last) the proclamation below, as a singular instance of the effect which Christianity produces on a mind evidently not without culture and widely extended information, standing outside of it, and in an attitude hostile to it. Of the many millions of our brethren at our antipodes, we have known but little save that they call us barbarians, and we have given them the credit of knowing utterly nothing about us. But the mandarin Vau is evidently quite familiar with the main truths (or errors) of Christianity as received by the majority of men. Vau is a mandarin of no very high rank, ruling a small part of the province of Canton, lying to the northeast, and *wearing a white button in his cap* (which indicates, the *Journal* tells us, the fifth in the sacred orders). He must be a man of some sense, for his arguments against the *phase* of religion which has come before his vision are conclusive. We commend to all believers in the Trinity the Chinaman's unsophisticated question, "How could a body that was master of heaven be so little master of itself that it could be spiked on the cross by the hands of vulgar mortals?" and the equally sound common sense which follows. His view of German politics and the comparison with Japan may excite a smile, but the argument certainly meets the case in hand, and answers the governor's purpose.

The occasion of the proclamation was briefly this. The daughter of a Christian, in the department Kayingchau, a province of Canton, married a Pagan. Her efforts to convert her husband's family excited their indignation, and they appealed to Vau, who set on foot a general persecution, destroyed one or more churches, and imprisoned several Christians, and, among others, a French missionary. This happened on the 31st of last August. On the 17th of September, the French minister, informed of the fact, interfered. The designs of Vau were arrested by the higher authorities, the missionary set at liberty, and the privilege secured to the Christians to establish and extend their church. We translate from the French translation.

"Vau, governor of the lower department of Kayingchau (province of Canton), etc., orders the publication of the present proclamation, so that the hearts of men may be held in the right road, and the laws retain the respect which is their due.

"Know, then, that there exists in the Western world a doctrine introduced there by Jesus. So long as the barbarians propagate or practise this doctrine among themselves, explain their books, and adore the Lord of heaven according to their liturgy, we have nothing to say; but it is not permitted them to introduce themselves into the central empire for the purpose of preaching this doctrine; and such subjects of the celestial empire as aid these strangers, come from distant countries, in penetrating into our territories, league themselves with them, inflame and trouble the spirit of the people, seduce the women to this doctrine, or commit any other offence against the laws, are punishable. The terms of the code are explicit; who will dare to violate them?

"In this department, the literary doctrines recognized by the law (i. e. Buddhism, Confucianism, and rationalism) are held in high consideration, and the character of the inhabitants is justly esteemed; descended from persons who have filled public offices, or bound to such functionaries by ties of blood, they certainly will not abandon the science of the sages and of the more illustrious by their virtues throughout the central empire, in order to run at a venture in chase of another doctrine. It has, however, come to my knowledge, that the simple and unenlightened inhabitants of the village of Chukaug and its vicinity have recently invited men of distant countries to come to them, and that some of them have concluded to unite themselves with these strangers, and that the women even have been affiliated to this new society, a serious infraction of the laws. It is, then, my duty to seek out those who have been guilty of giving aid to the strangers in coming to the country, to cause them to be arrested and severely punished according to the tenor of the laws anciently adopted, and also to publish a proclamation for the instruction of the people. In consequence, I publish the present for the instruction of all, the military as well as others.

"You will all know that Jesus, born in the time of Ngaiti, of the dynasty of the Hans, ought not to occupy in the estimation of man a higher rank than Hwatoh (Hippocrates of China), and others, since he could do no more than solace men by curing their diseases. The power which he had of nourishing a multitude of three thousand men with seven loaves of bread is no more a reality than the services of the rationalists. In other respects, there was no particular merit in it. As to his extravagant title of Lord who created the heavens, remember the princes, emperors, great philosophers, who shed civilization abroad, and were the agents of heaven a thousand and ten thousand years before Jesus. Believe that the different countries situated beyond the sea have had from the beginning of the world sovereigns, inhabitants, forms of government, and laws for the punishment of crime; is it, then, possible to say that none of these existed before Jesus appeared on the earth to create them from the time of the dynasty of the Hans.

"In the Hai-kwoh-tu-chi (an embellished Chinese encyclopædia of recent date, of which the famous Liu is said to be the author) you will discover that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was the wife of a man called Joseph, but that Jesus denied his father, and that, regarding himself as the child of his mother conceived while she was a virgin, he falsely affirmed that he was her glorious son created by Heaven. The converts to his

doctrine permit, then, no sacrifice to ancestors, or sovereigns, or the sacred representatives of supernatural beings. They trouble the spirit of the people with doubts, they teach them to believe that there exists neither heaven, nor law, nor father, nor sovereign superior to Jesus; that there is neither filial piety nor fidelity to the prince, nor sympathy for their equals, nor moral duties. Thus, the anger of Heaven was excited, and its judgment fell upon Jesus.

"In the name of Heaven, the king of Judea caused him to be seized, and, his crime having been proved, he was punished, according to the laws of the realm, by death on the cross. His blood flowed in such quantities that his body was covered with it. In seven days he was dead, and orders were given to the local authorities to have him buried. But his disciples, people without legal employment or means of subsistence, invented a fable, and pretended that, after having passed three days in the tomb, he revived, and forty days later ascended to heaven. This account was invented for the purpose of attracting men to the doctrine which they preached; but it resembles that which was told of Suu-Nyau, who, according to the story of his partisans, having been drowned after the defeat of his troops, became a spirit of the waters. It resembles, also, the fables of the faction of the white Lys, who declare that the bodies of their comrades, put to death by long and ignominious tortures, surrendered the spirits which animated them, and that they, disengaging themselves, mounted to heaven, called to another state among celestial beings.

"The fact could not have been as they relate, for if it were, how would it be possible that a body which was the master of heaven was so little master of itself that it could be put to death and spiked upon a cross by the hands of vulgar mortals? The incredible assertion of his disciples, that in his dignity of Lord of heaven he suffered the pains of sin for the love of man is as extremely ridiculous. Thus, to conceal the shame of a death on the cross, the body which is the grand minister of heaven and earth could do every thing except to remit to man the punishment of their sins, and, in order to accomplish this, he was obliged to submit to chastisement in their place.

"This doctrine pretends also to encourage virtue and repress vice; but the learned have always said the same. The dogma which pretends that the believers on the Lord of heaven will be happy, and that after death their spirits will mount to heaven, while those who do not believe will be exposed to all miseries, and after death their spirits will be condemned to the eternal prison of hell, — this doctrine is precisely the same as that of Wu-sau-sz: — 'Those who are good to me are good; those who are vile to me are vile.' Suppose that the believers on the Lord of heaven should be thieves or vicious persons, they will nevertheless be happy, while those who have not believed, although just and meritorious persons, are all condemned to misery. Never has that Divine Providence, which recompenses virtue and punishes vice, been changed and confounded on this point. Is not this doctrine fatal to those notions of good which heaven has given us?

"Then, the words 'palace of heaven' and 'prison of hell' are only plagiarisms from the most modern Buddhist books, and still the Christians scorn the Buddhists as people condemned to the eternal prison of hell. The crucifixion of Jesus while living is, like the tree of three swords and the mountain of arms in the hell of the Buddhists, absolutely impossible to prove.

"Be it known further, that, of all the nations beyond the seas, none has such strong faith in the Lord of heaven as Germany, and still her inhabitants are torn from all social and political bonds. Her power is in ruins, her territory has been more than once divided. Why, then, since she believes on the Lord of heaven, has not happiness been given her? Among the countries which do not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, none can compare with Japan. Upon the quay of her port, open to strangers, is graven a cross, and every merchant who comes there, who at his landing does not trample this image at once under foot, is immediately decapitated to serve for an example to others. Yet more. At the gate of the city is an image of Jesus buried in the soil, in order that it may be trampled under foot every day, and still this realm has lasted two thousand years. Why has not the Lord of heaven inflicted a terrible punishment upon it? This proves that the pretended power of rendering happy or unhappy is a fable without foundation. Its effects are plainly that, in this life, ignorant people leave the tombs of their ancestors without the sacrifices which are due to them, without perfumed incense, without the prescribed oblation; and that after death, they will be, in their turn, blind spectres, subjected to, beside the privations which I have just enumerated, the punishment of burning till their bones shall be reduced to ashes. What happiness can result from such a doctrine?

"Although an ordinance of recent date has recognized the right of the barbarians to discourse among themselves upon their sacred books of religion, it is not allowed them to establish themselves in the central empire, to mingle with its inhabitants, and to propagate their doctrines among them. If, then, there are those who invite the strangers, who unite with them for the purpose of agitating and troubling the public spirit, of converting the females, or violating the law in any way, they will be punished either by strangulation after imprisonment, or by transportation, or by the bastinado; the law allows no commutation. If, however, the guilty come of their own accord, and surrender themselves to the authorities, declare their repentance, and trample the cross under foot, in that case the punishment will be in some degree milder. The laws of the state are severe; but they have always left repentance open to the culpable. If, then, there are among you, simple people, any who have suffered themselves to be led astray, let them hasten to enter the path of safety; but know ye who persevere in crime, that it is my duty to arrest, condemn, and punish you, that ye may serve for examples to the perverse. The families of scholars, those whose members are in the public service, those who are descended from ancient functionaries, must make their resolutions known in the temples of their ancestors, expel from their tribes all children or brothers who may have adopted this doctrine as persons who have renounced the society of their relatives, dead and living. In the jurisdictions of the country, the magistrates of the village, and the principal inhabitants, should be prompt to inform; and if they discover members of any society who are employed in propagating this doctrine, they should give them no time to seduce or agitate the population, but they ought immediately to inform their superiors, and aid in arresting the guilty, if they would not themselves be treated as accomplices.

"By these means the hearts of men will be kept in the right way, and the laws will be more solemnly observed. It is my earnest wish that it may be so. Let each one tremble and obey."